DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 094 840 JC 740 296

TITLE	KOCE-TV Telecourse Evaluation. Student Reaction to Television Courses Fall Semester, 1973-74.
INSTITUTION	Coast Community Coll. District, Costa Mesa, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	Corporation for Public Broadcasting, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Aug 74
NOTE	108p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$5.40 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*College Curriculum; *Community Colleges; Data Collection; Evaluation Techniques; Independent Study; Institutional Research; Post Secondary Education; Program Evaluation; *Student Characteristics; *Student Reaction; Tables (Data); Teaching Techniques; Technical Reports; *Televised Instruction
IDENTIFIERS	*Coast Community College District

ABSTRACT

To assess the effectiveness of television courses offered by the Coast Community College District and to determine the characteristics of the television students, data from 1,126 students during three semesters were obtained. Sources by which the data were collected were a post-course evaluation questionnaire, weekly course diaries that rated 10 aspects of each lesson viewed, interviews, and demographic questionnaires. The results are presented in 56 tables. These results show that: the students were, in the main, Caucasian; more women than men took the courses; 60 percent were between 26 and 45 years of age; three in four were married; a high proportion had legal dependants; 10 percent had no prior college experience, but one in five had more than 60 units of college credit; and the strongest reason for taking a TV course was to earn credit toward a degree. The reactions of the students to the courses indicated that the majority of students felt that the material was presented to rapidly; most wanted more review sessions and seminars and at more varied times; some desired additional quizzes and how-to-study instruction; all felt that the opportunity to contact their facilitators was important; and all were enthusiastic, to a varying degree, about television as a way of learning. Appendixes provide: Course Diary Invitation Letter; Course Diary Form; Interview Set-Up Letter; TV Student Interview Form; Television Student Data Form; Student Evaluation of Television Course; Request Form for Student Evaluation of Television Courses; Student Evaluation; Lesson Number and Title, Psychology: "As Man Behaves"; Lesson Number and Title: "History of Art"; and Lesson Number and Title, Economics: "The Great Consumer Contest." (DB)

Coast Community College district
Evening College
2701 FAIRVIEW ROAD • COSTA MESA • CALIFORNIA 92626

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED 094840

KOCE-TV

TELECOURSE EVALUATION

STUDENT REACTION
TO
TELEVISION COURSES

FALL SEMESTER, 1973-74

JC 740 296

OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

AUGUST, 1974

ORANGE COAST COLLEGE
COSTA MESA

GOLDEN WEST COLLEGE
HUNTINGTON BEACH

PREFACE

This report describes the proceedings and results of one portion of a research project funded by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting to determine the ecucational and public service needs of the service area of KOCE, a public UHF station owned and operated by the Coast Community College District. This report discusses student reaction to television courses offered by the Coast Community College District.

We wish to acknowledge the help of Richard W. Brightman and Jean Riss for the research design and procedures employed in this survey. To Miss Chris Yanick, who turned our jottings into a typewritten report, we are much indebted.

We have high hopes that this study will contribute to improved understanding, better and more significant research, and to the improvement of future television course offerings.

For additional information about the project, write to the Office of Institutional Research, Coast Community College District, 1370 Adams Avenue, Costa Mesa, California, 92626.

CAROL E. TERAZ
PROJECT RESEARCHER

MONTY W. RUTH
PROJECT DIRECTOR

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	1
List of Tables	ii
Procedures	2
The Television Student Dissected	5
Marital Status, Number of Dependents	7
Occupation	8
Income	9
Hours Worked	10
Transportation, Handicaps	12
Level of Education	12
Reason for Taking TV Courses	14
On-Campus Activities	15
Housewives	16
Visiting Campus in Conjunction with TV Course	19
How Students Learn about Television Courses	20
Day Preferred for Viewing Lesson	22
Time Preferred for Viewing Lesson	23
Location Where TV Lesson Was Watched	25
Contact with Facilitator	25
Study Sessions	26
Would Recommend Course	26
Do Television Students Become On-Campus Students?	28
Student Evaluation of Television Courses	29
Post-Course Student Evaluation	29

Table of Contents

	Page
Course Diary	33
Psychology	33
History of Art	34
Consumer Contest	35
Course Diary Lesson Analysis	36
Completion Rates and Grade Distribution	46
Psychology	46
History of Art	48
The Great Consumer Contest	49
TV Student Interviews	51
Psychology	58
History of Art	59
The Great Consumer Contest	59
Conclusions	60

LIST OF TABLES

Tables		Page
1	NUMBERS OF STUDENTS PROVIDING DATA FOR TELEVISION COURSE EVALUATION	4
2	RACIAL BACKGROUND	6
3	SEX	6
4	AGE	7
5	LEGAL DEPENDENTS	7
5A	NUMBER OF DEPENDENTS OF ON-CAMPUS AND TELEVISION STUDENTS	8
6	STUDENTS HAVING THREE OR MORE DEPENDENTS	8
7	OCCUPATION OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD: TV STUDENTS	9
8	ANNUAL FAMILY INCOMES OF ON-CAMPUS AND TELEVISION STUDENTS	10
9	NUMBER OF HOURS WORKED PER WEEK BY ON-CAMPUS AND TV STUDENTS	10
10	PERIOD OF DAY MOST OFTEN WORKED BY TELEVISION STUDENTS	11
11	HOURS WORKED PER WEEK: ON-CAMPUS VS. TV STUDENTS	11
12	AMOUNT OF EDUCATION REPORTED BY TV STUDENTS	12
13	AMOUND OF EDUCATION OF TV STUDENTS BY CLASS	13
14	AMOUNT OF EDUCATION OF TAKERS VS. NON-TAKERS	14
15	REASONS FOR TAKING TV COURSES	15
16	TV STUDENTS WHO ARE FULL- OR PART-TIME STUDENTS	15
17	TV COURSE STUDENTS' PREFERRED AMOUNT OF TIME ON CAMPUS	16
18	AGES OF HOUSEWIFE-TV STUDENTS COMPARED WITH TV STUDENTS OVERALL.	16
19	NUMBER OF LEGAL DEPENDENTS REPORTED BY HOUSEWIVES COMPARED WITH TV STUDENTS OVERALL	17
20	HOURS WORKED PER WEEK--HOUSEWIVES COMPARED TO ALL TV STUDENTS.	18
21	REASON FOR TAKING TV COURSES--HOUSEWIVES COMPARED TO ALL TV STUDENTS	18
22	PREFERRED AMOUNT OF TIME ON CAMPUS: HOUSEWIVES VS. ALL TV COURSE STUDENTS	19
23	ARE CURRENTLY FULL- OR PART-TIME STUDENTS: HOUSEWIVES VS. TV STUDENTS OVERALL	19
24	SOURCE OF INFORMATION ABOUT TELEVISION COURSES	20

Tables		Page
25	ON- VS. OFF-CAMPUS INFORMATION SOURCES ABOUT TV COURSES	21
26	SOURCE OF INFORMATION ABOUT TV COURSES: FINAL EXAM TAKERS VS. NON-TAKERS	22
27	DAY PREFERRED FOR VIEWING TELEVISION LESSON	22
28	PREFERRED VIEWING TIME FOR TV LESSON: TAKERS VS. NON-TAKERS . .	24
29	STUDENTS PREFERRING A VIEWING TIME BETWEEN 8:00 and 4:00	24
30	VIEWING LOCATION PREFERENCE OF TV STUDENTS, FALL, 1973-74 . . .	25
31	PERCENTAGE OF TV STUDENTS WHO CONTACTED COURSE FACILITATOR . . .	26
32	WOULD TV STUDENT RECOMMEND THE COURSE TO SOMEONE ELSE?	27
33	PERCENTAGE WHO WOULD ENROLL IN ANOTHER TV COURSE	27
34	TV COURSE ENROLLMENT, FALL, 1973-74	28
35	MEAN SCORES: PSYCHOLOGY POST-COURSE EVALUATION, FALL, 1973-74 .	30
36	MEAN SCORES: PSYCHOLOGY POST-COURSE EVALUATION, SPRING, 1972-73	31
37	MEAN SCORES: HISTORY OF ART POST-COURSE EVALUATION, FALL, 1973-74	32
38	COMPARISON OF COURSE DIARY EVALUATIONS AND POST-COURSE STUDENT EVALUATIONS: PSYCHOLOGY, FALL, 1973-74	33
39	MEAN SCORES: PSYCHOLOGY COURSE DIARY EVALUATION, FALL, 1973-74 .	34
40	COMPARISON OF COURSE DIARY EVALUATIONS AND POST-COURSE STUDENT EVALUATIONS: HISTORY OF ART, FALL, 1973-74	34
41	MEAN SCORES, COURSE DIARY EVALUATION: HISTORY OF ART, FALL, 1973-74	35
42	MEAN SCORES, COURSE DIARY EVALUATION: CONSUMER CONTEST, FALL, 1973-74	35
43	COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES FOR FALL, 1973-74 TELEVISION COURSES .	36
44	MEAN SCORES; LESSON ANALYSIS: PSYCHOLOGY, FALL, 1973-74	38
45	MEAN SCORES; LESSON ANALYSIS: HISTORY OF ART, FALL, 1973-74 . .	40
46	MEAN SCORES; LESSON ANALYSIS: CONSUMER CONTEST, FALL, 1973-74. .	42
47	READING COMPONENTS: TEXT AND SYLLABUS, TELEVISION LESSONS, FALL, 1973-74	44
48	TV LESSON COMPONENTS: CONTENT, PACE, SCOPE AND BALANCE, OVERALL ACADEMIC QUALITY, TELEVISION LESSONS, FALL, 1973-74	45
49	COMPARISON OF COMPLETION RATES FOR PSYCHOLOGY STUDENTS	46
50	PERCENTAGE GRADE DISTRIBUTION, PSYCHOLOGY	47

Tables		Page
51	COMPARISON OF COMPLETION RATES FOR HISTORY OF ART STUDENTS . . .	48
52	PERCENTAGE GRADE DISTRIBUTION: HISTORY OF ART	49
53	COMPARISON OF COMPLETION RATES FOR CONSUMER CONTEST	49
54	PERCENTAGE GRADE DISTRIBUTION: CONSUMER CONTEST	50
55	TELEVISION STUDENT INTERVIEWS	51
56	RESPONSES FOR TV STUDENT INTERVIEWS	54

In November, 1972, the Coast Community College District began operating television station KOCE, a noncommercial educational broadcasting television station serving Orange County, California. In addition to providing comprehensive public-service broadcasting to the Orange County area, KOCE has also embarked on a program of extending educational opportunities by providing community college television courses produced and broadcast by the station.

In the spring semester, 1973-74, KOCE commenced broadcasting educational television courses. A total of 1,388 Orange County residents enrolled in the three classes offered. More than one in three of those for whom we have data were not on-campus students or, indeed, students of any kind. In order to assess the effectiveness of these televised course offerings and to discover the characteristics of these television students, we have obtained data which examine both these student types in some detail.

In preparing this report on student response to the television courses given by the Coast Community College over the past three semesters, we pursued two major lines of inquiry: 1) How do students rate the several aspects

of these courses? 2) What sort of student enrolls in a television course? Student evaluation of television courses includes individual assessment of the quality of the televised lesson and coordination of such parts of the course as texts, tests, review sessions and other formal college assistance. Students' work schedules, viewing time preferences, and educational goals are analyzed as well as basic data on age, sex, occupation, and income.

PROCEDURES

Several kinds of data from three semesters--spring 1972-73, summer 1973, and fall 1973-74--have been integrated. Sizeable groups of students from all three semesters completed a post-course evaluation questionnaire. A designated group of fall semester television students maintained weekly Course Diaries in which they rated ten aspects of each lesson they viewed. In addition, 51 of these students were interviewed individually with the aim of eliciting more detailed and subjective responses to their television class experience. Finally, demographic questionnaires were distributed to all spring and fall semester television students.

During the spring semester, 1972-73, the Coast Community College District offered three courses over television. The courses were *As Man Behaves*, an introductory course in psychology; *The Great Consumer Contest*, a course in consumer economics; and *Introduction to Physical Geography*. The latter two were developed under the auspices of the Southern California Television Consortium, a group of two-year community colleges which share the cost of television course development. *As Man Behaves* was developed at the studio facilities of the Coast Community College District Telecommunications Center.

Spring semester students taking the final exam were given a post-course evaluation questionnaire to complete at that time. Students who did not take the final exam were mailed the same questionnaire. Those who did not return this first questionnaire were mailed a second one.

During the summer 1973 session, one televised course, a business course entitled *Law for the '70s*, was offered. It was also produced by the Consortium. As in the spring, law students at the final exam filled out a post-course evaluation form. Those not taking the exam were mailed the same questionnaire.

During the fall 1973-74 semester, three courses were broadcast by the Coast Community College District: *As Man Behaves* and *The Great Consumer Contest* were offered for a second time, and *History of Art* was introduced. Data gathered from these students assumes additional significance, since the post-course student evaluations can be compared to the spring data. Psychology was the only course which provided parallel kinds of information, since the art course was not offered in the spring, and no evaluation was asked of the fall economics students. In addition, two more methods of evaluating the television courses were initiated.

Students enrolled in each of the three fall television courses were asked to maintain a Course Diary, a device whereby students mailed in a weekly evaluation of the lessons they watched, along with information concerning the day, time, TV channel, and location at which the lesson was viewed. All students taking fall television courses were sent a letter (see Appendix 1) inviting them to maintain the weekly Course Diaries (Appendix 2). The number of participating students was to be restricted to 100 because of limitations

on available funds. Students who agreed to maintain the Course Diary also agreed to an interview, which took place between the seventh and eleventh week of the course. Its purpose was to obtain, on a more subjective, open-ended basis, each student's impressions, criticisms, and opinions of his televised learning experience. Upon completing both the semester's weekly diaries and the interview, each student would receive $10.

Demographic questionnaires were mailed to all spring and fall semester television students (Appendix 4). The number of students from these courses who provided data for each phase of the study will be found in Table 1.

	Post-course Evaluation	Course Diary	Interview	Demographic Information
Spring 1972-73				
Consumer economics	290	-	-	-
Geography	229	-	-	-
Psychology	317	-	-	-
Totals	836			396
Summer 1973				
Law	176	-	-	-
Fall 1973-74				
Art	126	37	22	-
Consumer economics	-	30	16	-
Psychology	164	27	13	-
Totals	290	94	51	359

TABLE 1

NUMBERS OF STUDENTS PROVIDING
DATA FOR TELEVISION COURSE EVALUATION

While it is of interest to compare responses from students taking different television courses, such comparisons need to be made with caution. Different subjects naturally attract students with somewhat differing backgrounds,

tastes, and needs. For example, psychology is required for all students at one of the two Coast campuses, Orange Coast College. Our data show that psychology students have somewhat less education than students taking other television courses; and, in fact, the two groups of psychology students for which we have data seem to resemble one another more than they resemble any other class group.

THE TELEVISION STUDENT DISSECTED

What sort of person takes a television course? Does he differ from the on-campus community college student and, if so, in what ways?

The mythical "average" student taking a television course through the Coast Community College District is somewhat older than his on-campus counterpart, more likely to be married, quite possibly either a housewife or working full-time, has more dependents than the on-campus student, and is less likely to complete the course in which he is enrolled. A majority are working toward a degree. These characteristics are fairly consistent for both spring 1972-73 television students and those taking a TV course in the fall of 1973-74.

We are able to describe these students demographically by race, sex, age, marital status, number of dependents, occupation, level of education and family income, as well as whether they are handicapped or do not have transportation to campus readily available. We also have data on how TV students find out about their courses, the days and times they prefer to watch TV lessons, and the degree to which they utilize facilitators and study sessions.

Race, Age, Sex

As with the on-campus students at Coast, television students are overwhelmingly Caucasian; and, as for the college as a whole, Orange County's minorities are statistically under-represented. The population of television students, however, is not unlike that of the Coast Community College District as a whole, which serves only a portion of Orange County. See Table 2.

	Spring, 1972-73		Fall, 1973-74	
	On-Campus	TV	On-Campus	TV
	%	%	%	%
Caucasian	89.4	91.9	89.2	92.8
Mexican	2.9	2.0	3.1	1.9
Black	.3	.5	.3	.6
Oriental	1.4	.5	1.3	.6
Indian	.7	.8	.5	.8
Other	1.7	1.0	1.7	1.1
Decline to State	3.6	3.3	4.0	2.8

TABLE 2

RACIAL BACKGROUND

Unlike on-campus enrollment, where the ratio of men to women is nearly equal, somewhat more women than men take TV courses, as shown in Table 3.

	Spring, 1972-73	Fall, 1973-74	
	On-Campus	On-Campus	TV
	%	%	%
Male	51.9	50.7	44.8
Female	48.1	49.3	54.6

TABLE 3

SEX

We have data on age only for fall TV course students. Sixty percent of them were between 26 and 45. One in three is over 35 (Table 4).

	Fall, 1973-74	
	No.	%
Aged 15-17	4	1.1
18-25	81	22.6
26-35	150	41.8
36-45	67	18.7
46-60	49	13.6
Over 60	8	2.2

TABLE 4

AGE

Marital Status, Number of Dependents

About three in every four TV students are married, while a little less than half of the on-campus students are. Further, TV courses seem to have attracted a somewhat larger percentage of married students in the fall, 1973-74 than the preceding spring. As compared with on-campus students, a higher proportion of TV students have legal dependents (Tables 5 and 5A).

	Spring, 1972-73		Fall, 1973-74	
	On-Campus	TV	On-Campus	TV
	%	%	%	%
None	34.6	31.3	42.6	28.7
1	13.4	14.4	14.6	13.4
2	10.8	17.4	10.3	18.7
3	6.7	16.2	7.2	21.7
4	3.6	9.1	3.4	8.4
More than 4	3.0	10.6	2.7	8.6
No reply	27.9	1.0	19.2	8.6

TABLE 5

LEGAL DEPENDENTS

	Spring, 1972-73				Fall, 1973-74			
	On-Campus		TV		On-Campus		TV	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
None	12,212	34.6	124	31.3	16,852	42.6	103	28.7
1	4,730	13.4	57	14.4	5,795	14.6	48	13.4
2	3,813	10.8	69	17.4	4,074	10.3	67	18.7
3	2,364	6.7	64	16.2	2,829	7.2	78	21.7
More than 4	1,059	3.0	42	10.6	1,056	2.7	31	8.6
No reply	9,847	27.9	4	1.0	7.604	19.2	-	-
Totals	35,294	100.0	396	100.0	39,559	100.0	359	100.0

TABLE 5A

NUMBER OF DEPENDENTS OF
ON-CAMPUS AND TELEVISION STUDENTS

Further, those who are TV students have a greater number of dependents, as Table 6 reveals.

Spring, 1972-73				Fall, 1973-74			
On-Campus		TV		On-Campus		TV	
No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
4,693	13.3	142	35.9	5,234	13.2	139	38.7

TABLE 6

STUDENTS HAVING THREE OR MORE DEPENDENTS

Occupation

Because our questionnaires for spring 1972-73 and fall 1973-74 semester students differed somewhat, no direct comparison of occupations is possible between the two groups.

	Spring, 1972-73			Fall, 1973-74	
	No.	%		No.	%
Business Executive	13	3.3	Business Executive	16	4.5
Educator	24	6.0	Fine Arts	5	1.4
Fine Arts	5	1.3	Military	3	.8
Professional	56	14.1	Office	37	10.3
Military	2	.5	Professional	62	17.3
Technician	15	3.8	Sales/Customer Service	43	12.0
Tradesman/Journeyman/ Technician	25	6.3			
Self-Employed	14	3.5	Self-Employed	20	5.6
Not Currently Employed	128	32.3	Not Currently Employed	59	16.4
Other	111	28.0	Other	53	14.8
Totals	396	100.0	Totals	359	100.0

TABLE 7

OCCUPATION OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD:
TV STUDENTS

The rather sizeable number of respondents who checked *other* occupations or *not currently employed* were further analyzed. Although neither questionnaire offered the choice of *housewife* as an occupation, enough women checked either one of these categories and further wrote in *housewife* or an equivalent, to justify analyzing this group of women separately. This would seem so particularly in the light of current interest in this group as potential consumers of televised higher education. More than one in every five TV students voluntarily designated themselves as housewives: These data are examined in some detail on pages 8 and 9.

Income

Family incomes are somewhat higher for television students than for those on campus, as shown in Table 8.

	Spring, 1972-73		Fall, 1973-74	
	On-Campus	TV	On-Campus	TV
	%	%	%	%
Under $3,000	10.2	5.8	0.2	6.1
$3,000 - $5,999	11.7	7.3	12.2	4.2
$6,999 - $9,999	18.7	14.1	16.8	13.4
$10,000 - $14,999	25.1	32.8	25.1	30.1
$15,000 or more	18.9	30.2	20.9	36.5
Decline to state	15.4	9.6	15.7	9.5

TABLE 8

ANNUAL FAMILY INCOMES OF
ON-CAMPUS AND TELEVISION STUDENTS

The average family income of the spring TV student was $12,024, in comparison with $10,085 for on-campus students. For fall, TV students' annual family income averaged $12,664, compared with $10,374 for on-campus students. Two-thirds of the TV students reported an annual family income of $10,000 or over, as compared with less than half of the on-campus population.

Hours Worked

Table 9 shows the number of hours worked each week. Half the fall TV students worked a 30-hour week or more.

	Spring, 1972-73		Fall, 1973-74	
	On-Campus	TV	On-Campus	TV
	%	%	%	%
None	16.8	33.1	15.3	25.9
1-30	34.2	17.7	27.7	17.6
More than 30	46.7	49.2	54.9	55.4

TABLE 9

NUMBER OF HOURS WORKED PER WEEK
BY ON-CAMPUS AND TV STUDENTS

The number of nonworking students, both on and off campus, declined from spring to fall while the number of those working more than 30 hours increased. Of those television students who do work, the great majority are employed during the day, as shown in Table 10.

	Spring, 1972-73		Fall, 1973-74	
	No.	%	No.	%
Day (8:00-5:00)	239	59.0	232	64.6
Night (5:00-1:00)	18	4.4	20	5.6
Graveyard (1:00-8:00)	10	2.5	9	2.5
Do not work	126	31.1	97	27.0

TABLE 10

PERIOD OF DAY MOST OFTEN
WORKED BY TELEVISION STUDENTS

About one in four indicate that their work schedule changes frequently, which may be a factor in their taking a television course. In comparison with the number of hours worked for on-campus students (Table 11), TV students are less likely to be working part-time; more likely to report being unemployed or working.

	Spring, 1972-73		Fall, 1973-74	
	On-Campus	TV	On-Campus	TV
	%	%	%	%
None	16.8	33.1	15.3	25.9
1-30	34.2	17.7	27.7	17.6
More than 30	46.7	49.2	54.9	55.4

TABLE 11

HOURS WORKED PER WEEK:
ON-CAMPUS VS. TV STUDENTS

Transportation, Handicaps

Both the lack of available transportation and the presence of a physical handicap are factors which, it might be supposed, would predispose one to take a TV course. Few TV students reported any physical handicaps--20 of 396 in the spring of 1972-73 and only 14 of 359 in the fall of 1973-74. Furthermore, 9 in 10 have transportation available if they want to come on campus.

Level of Education

Table 12 shows composite data about education completed for students enrolled in the spring 1972-73 and fall 1973-74 semesters.

Spring and Fall Semesters	No.	%
High school graduate or less	114	10.1
0 - 60 units	750	66.6
Over 60 units	226	20.1

TABLE 12

AMOUNT OF EDUCATION
REPORTED BY TV STUDENTS

Of the 1,126 television students for whom we have data, 10 percent had no college experience prior to taking their television course. Two-thirds indicate they've had some college work, having accumulated up to 60 units. One in five already had more than 60 units of college credit.

	Spring, 1972-73			Summer, 1973	Fall, 1973-74	
	Psych.	Consumer Economics	Geo.	Law	Art	Psych.
	%	%	%	%	%	%
High school grad or less	12.6	10.0	5.2	8.5	4.0	17.1
0 - 60 units	66.9	65.5	66.4	58.5	67.5	67.7
Over 60 units	13.6	23.8	24.5	29.0	27.8	14.0
No answer	6.0	.7	3.9	3.4	.8	1.2

TABLE 13

AMOUNT OF EDUCATION
OF TV STUDENTS BY CLASS

Table 13 shows a somewhat larger percentage of such students enrolled in psychology in both the spring and fall. As noted earlier, psychology is a required course on one of the two Coast campuses. This suggests that students just entering college from high school may form a larger portion of its enrollment at that college. On the other hand, the summer 1973 course, *Law for the '70s*, attracted the highest proportion of students in the *most educated* category. We wanted to discover if there were any relationship between a student's educational experience and whether or not he finished his television course. See Table 14.

	Spring, 1972-73						Fall, 1973-74	
	Psychology		Consumer Economics		Geography		Psychology	
	Takers	Non-Takers	Takers	Non-Takers	Takers	Non-Takers	Takers	Non-Takers
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
High school grad or less	11.5	15.0	10.3	8.7	6.1	3.0	13.4	40.9
0 - 60 units	65.6	61.0	66.0	63.0	63.8	72.7	70.4	50.0
Over 60 units	12.9	15.0	23.0	28.3	26.4	19.7	14.8	9.1
No answer	6.0	9.0	.8	-	3.7	4.6	1.4	-

TABLE 14

AMOUNT OF EDUCATION OF TAKERS VS. NON-TAKERS

Only for the two psychology classes is the percentage of non-takers with no college education higher than the percentage of takers. Conversely, the proportion of non-takers for consumer economics is higher for those with the most education. This fact may be related to the somewhat lower course evaluation the consumer course received, accompanied by the fairly frequent comment that the course was "too easy" or "amateurish."

Reason for Taking TV Courses

The strongest reason for taking a television course is that of earning credit toward a degree as Table 15 indicates.

	Spring, 1972-73		Fall, 1973-74	
	No.	%	No.	%
Earn credit toward degree	252	63.6	215	59.9
General interest	89	22.0	74	20.6
Professional advancement	46	11.6	59	16.4
Other	4	1.0	10	2.8
High school credit	10	2.5	3	.8

TABLE 15

REASONS FOR TAKING TV COURSES

Over sixty percent of the spring 1972-73 and fall 1973-74 television students considered themselves full- or part-time students.

		Spring, 1972-73		Fall, 1973-74	
		No.	%	No.	%
Yes:	2-year community college	212	52.4	229	63.8
Yes:	extension/correspondence	33	8.2	17	4.7
Yes:	Calif. State University	14	3.5	14	3.9
Yes:	High school	12	3.0	7	1.9
Yes:	University of California	-	-	3	.8
No		128	31.6	88	24.5

TABLE 16

TV STUDENTS WHO ARE FULL- OR PART-TIME STUDENTS

On-Campus Activities

A clear majority of TV students say that they would prefer to visit the campus occasionally as part of their TV course. About one in four would be content never to come on campus and at least one in ten would like to come to the campus regularly, as Table 17 illustrates.

	Spring, 1972-73	Fall, 1973-74
	%	%
Visit a campus regularly	11.6	13.6
Visit a campus occasionally	58.8	61.3
Never visit a campus	28.0	23.7

TABLE 17

TV COURSE STUDENTS' PREFERRED
AMOUNT OF TIME ON CAMPUS

Housewives

As already observed, sufficiently large numbers of respondents volunteered their occupation as *housewife* to warrant examining the specific characteristics of this sub-group. Moreover, this segment of the population has been suggested as a logical target for television courses.

In the spring 1972-73 semester, 98 of 396 (24.8%) respondents were housewives. In the fall 1973-74 semester, 82 of 359 (22.8%) so designated themselves. In each case, more than one of every five TV students were housewives.

	Students Overall		Housewives	
	No.	%	No.	%
15 - 17	4	1.1	-	-
18 - 25	81	22.6	17	20.7
26 - 35	150	41.8	36	43.9
36 - 45	67	18.7	17	20.7
46 - 60	49	13.6	12	14.6
Over 60	8	2.2	-	-

TABLE 18

AGES OF HOUSEWIFE-TV STUDENTS
COMPARED WITH TV STUDENTS OVERALL

As shown in Table 18, the age range of housewife-TV students does not differ significantly from that of TV students as a whole. Most are married (as against being divorced or widowed)--94 percent of those in the spring semester, 99 percent of those in the fall--and they report a higher ratio of dependents than TV students overall.

	Spring, 1972-73		Fall, 1973-74	
	Housewives %	All TV Students %	Housewives %	All TV Students %
None	27.6	31.3	26.8	28.7
One	14.3	14.4	11.0	13.4
Two	20.4	17.4	22.0	18.7
Three	12.2	16.2	15.9	21.7
Four	11.2	9.1	9.7	8.4
More than 4	11.2	10.6	12.2	8.6

TABLE 19

NUMBER OF LEGAL DEPENDENTS REPORTED BY HOUSEWIVES COMPARED WITH TV STUDENTS OVERALL

It may be supposed from Table 19 that the number of dependents indicated by the housewives are solely children which is not as true of responses by employed men, who are likely to include wives as legal dependents.

Housewives as a sub-group report a higher family income than TV students overall. Seventy-nine percent have an annual family income of $10,000 or above as opposed to 62.9 percent for the total TV student population.

The number of hours worked per week reported by this group is of interest. Most checked *none*. The next highest category is *50 or more*: this suggests a minority view which regards housewives' activities as comparable to employment outside the home, and virtually neverending. See Table 20.

	Spring, 1972-73		Fall, 1973-74	
	All TV Students %	Housewives %	All TV Students %	Housewives %
None	33.1	81.6	25.9	85.4
1 - 9	3.0	2.0	2.8	-
10 - 19	6.1	-	21.4	-
20 - 20	8.6	2.0	8.4	1.2
30 - 39	6.8	2.0	4.7	1.2
40 - 49	36.4	3.1	39.6	-
50 or more	6.1	8.2	11.1	11.0
No answer	-	1.0	-	1.2

TABLE 20

HOURS WORKED PER WEEK--HOUSEWIVES COMPARED TO ALL TV STUDENTS

When asked if they had any physical handicaps which prevented or made it difficult for them to leave home, 94 percent in the spring and 93 percent in the fall said *no*. Of the few who checked *yes*, more than two-thirds wrote "children" to describe their infirmity.

As for their most important reason for taking a TV course, earning credit toward a degree was even more prominent for housewives than for TV students as a whole (Table 21).

	Spring, 1972-73		Fall, 1973-74	
	Housewives %	All TV Students %	Housewives %	All TV Students %
Earn credit toward a degree	58.2	57.8	67.1	59.9
General interest	32.6	22.5	29.3	20.6
Professional advancement	-	11.4	-	16.4
Other	3.1	5.3	2.4	2.8
High school credit	5.1	2.3	1.2	2.3

TABLE 21

REASON FOR TAKING TV COURSES--HOUSEWIVES COMPARED TO ALL TV STUDENTS

Visiting Campus in Conjunction with TV Course

The data in Table 22 show that as with TV students in general, a majority of housewives would prefer to visit the college campus occasionally in conjunction with their TV course. However, as a group they show somewhat greater interest in visiting the campus regularly: About one in five would like to do so, as opposed to one in ten of TV students overall.

	Spring, 1972-73		Fall, 1973-74	
	Housewives %	All TV Students %	Housewives %	All TV Students %
Visit a campus regularly	12.2	11.6	21.9	13.6
Visit a campus occasionally	61.2	58.8	59.8	61.3
Never visit campus	26.5	28.0	15.9	23.7

TABLE 22

PREFERRED AMOUNT OF TIME ON CAMPUS:
HOUSEWIVES VS. ALL TV COURSE STUDENTS

Housewives as a group are somewhat less prone to think of themselves as full- or part-time students than are TV students in general, as Table 23 illustrates.

	Spring, 1972-73		Fall, 1973-74	
	Housewives %	All TV Students %	Housewives %	All TV Students %
Yes: 2-year community college	43.0	52.4	46.1	63.8
Yes: extension/correspondence	6.1	8.2	2.4	4.7
Yes: Calif. State University	2.0	3.5	2.4	3.9
Yes: High school	2.0	3.0	1.2	1.9
Yes: University of Calif.	-	-	-	.8
No	46.0	31.6	37.8	24.5

TABLE 23

ARE CURRENTLY FULL- OR PART-TIME STUDENTS:
HOUSEWIVES VS. TV STUDENTS OVERALL

How Students Learn about Television Courses

Students first learn about TV courses in a variety of ways, both on campus and off. Further, overall awareness of TV courses is increasing: As shown in Table 24, higher percentages of students learned about their courses both from on-campus and off-campus sources in the fall of 1973-74 than those from the preceding spring.

	Spring, 1972-73			Summer, 1973	Fall, 1973-74	
	Consumer Economics %	Geo. %	Psych. %	Law %	Art %	Psych. %
On Campus						
Picked up brochure	28.9	28.0	18.3	41.5	26.2	23.8
Class schedule	21.4	20.3	18.9	23.3	31.0	20.7
Counselor	2.0	.4	2.2	2.8	.8	1.8
Announcement read by instructor	1.7	-	.3	1.7	-	1.2
Bulletin board poster	1.4	.4	1.3	1.1	-	.6
Other	4.4	4.8	2.8	2.8	3.2	5.5
Off Campus						
TV announcement	10.0	7.9	10.7	5.7	5.6	7.3
Radio announcement	.7	.4	-	-	-	.6
Newspaper article	.7	5.7	-	-	11.9	7.9
Mail brochure	22.0	24.9	25.2	10.8	25.4	32.9
Friend	10.7	6.6	10.4	9.0	12.7	19.5
Other	3.8	2.6	10.4	1.1	2.4	1.8

(Since many students gave more than one answer, percentages will add up to more than 100%.)

TABLE 24

SOURCE OF INFORMATION ABOUT TELEVISION COURSES

On campus, the schedule of classes and brochures are the most likely ways for students to learn about TV courses. Off campus, the mail brochure is the most consistently effective way to inform students about TV classes--about one

in four learned of their current class in this manner--and seems to have been a little more effective in attracting psychology students.

Word-of-mouth also appears to be rather effective: Overall, one in ten students learned about TV courses from a friend, off campus.

More students learned about their TV class on campus than off--except for the psychology students.

	Spring, 1972-73			Summer, 1973	Fall, 1973-74	
	Consumer Economics %	Geo. %	Psych. %	Law %	Art %	Psych. %
On Campus	59.7	62.9	43.9	73.6	61.1	53.7
Off Campus	57.1	48.0	65.9	39.2	57.9	70.1

(Since some students gave more than one answer, percentages will equal more than 100%.)

TABLE 25

ON- VS. OFF-CAMPUS INFORMATION SOURCES
ABOUT TV COURSES

The data in Table 25 suggest that a larger percentage of the psychology students were not previously affiliated with the campus, and possibly were attracted by the advance advertising for the course or by the nature of the course itself. As we've already seen, a higher percentage of the psychology students reported having no education beyond high school. When the psychology students are divided into those who took the final exam and those who didn't, the non-takers (who are presumed not to have completed the course) are more likely to have found out about their course off campus, as Table 26 shows.

	Spring, 1972-73				Summer, 1973				Fall, 1973-74			
	Consumer Economics				Law				Psychology			
	Takers		Non-takers		Takers		Non-takers		Takers		Non-takers	
	No.	%	no.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
On Campus	145	59.4	28	60.9	118	73.6	11	68.8	76	53.5	12	54.6
Off Campus	138	56.6	28	60.9	63	39.4	6	37.5	96	67.6	19	86.4
	Geography											
On Campus	101	62.0	43	65.1								
Off Campus	75	46.0	35	53.0								
	Psychology											
On Campus	103	47.5	36	36.0								
Off Campus	136	62.7	73	73.0								

TABLE 26

SOURCE OF INFORMATION ABOUT TV COURSES:
FINAL EXAM TAKERS VS. NON-TAKERS

Day Preferred for Viewing Lesson

Most students preferred to watch their television lesson Monday through Thursdays. More than a third chose each of these weekdays (many cited more than one day). As seen in Table 27, more fall than spring TV students found Friday or Saturday lesson viewing desirable, however, and about one in six of these fall students would like to watch their lesson on Sunday.

	Spring, 1972-73		Summer, 1973		Fall, 1973-74	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Monday	316	37.8	62	35.2	117	40.3
Tuesday	358	42.8	52	30.7	122	42.1
Wednesday	324	38.8	64	36.4	114	39.3
Thursday	258	30.9	43	24.4	101	34.8
Friday	154	18.4	39	22.1	59	20.3
Saturday	75	9.0	54	30.7	43	14.8
Sunday	74	8.9	34	19.3	54	18.6
No answer	71	8.5	6	3.4	9	3.1

(Since many students checked more than one day, percentages will add up to more than 100%.)

TABLE 27

DAY PREFERRED FOR VIEWING TELEVISION LESSON

The preferences of summer TV students as to viewing day were fairly evenly distributed throughout the week. Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Saturday were somewhat preferred. Surprisingly, about one in five preferred Sunday viewing.

Time Preferred for Viewing Lesson

The majority of TV students prefer to view their lessons in the early morning or in the evening. This is consistent with our other data, which show that the majority of the students are employed full-time during the day.

Further examination of students' viewing time preferences (Table 28) reveals interesting differences among students of different subjects and between those who finished their classes (final exam takers) and those who didn't (non-takers). In every case, when we compared viewing time preferences of takers with non-takers, a higher number of non-takers cited midday viewing hours as being best for them.

Spring, 1972-73

	Consumer Economics				Geography				Psychology			
	Takers		Non-Takers		Takers		Non-Takers		Takers		Non-Takers	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
6-8 am	80	33.0	10	21.7	88	54.0	20	30.3	38	17.5	21	21.0
8-11 am	39	16.0	8	17.4	22	13.5	13	19.7	22	10.4	11	11.0
11 am-1 pm	6	2.5	6	13.0	6	3.7	1	1.5	8	3.7	10	10.0
1-4 pm	25	10.0	7	15.2	14	8.6	11	16.7	21	9.7	14	14.0
4-7 pm	73	29.9	9	19.6	34	20.9	17	25.8	91	41.9	31	31.0
7-11 pm	54	22.1	13	28.3	35	21.5	20	30.3	67	30.9	34	34.0
11 pm-1 am	9	3.7	5	10.9	12	7.4	3	4.6	11	5.0	7	7.0
1-8 am	2	.8	3	6.5	5	3.0	2	3.0	2	.9	-	-
No answer	9	3.7	-	-	3	1.8	-	-	5	2.3	3	3.0

Continued next page

	Summer, 1973				Fall, 1973-74			
	Takers		Non-Takers		Takers		Non-Takers	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
6-8 am	67	41.9	4	25.0	23	16.2	5	22.7
8-11 am	12	7.5	3	18.8	17	21.0	4	18.2
11 am-1 pm	5	3.1	3	18.8	10	7.0	6	27.3
1-4 pm	14	8.8	2	12.5	18	12.7	3	13.6
4-7 pm	52	32.5	3	18.8	52	36.6	4	18.2
7-11 pm	46	28.8	5	31.3	48	33.8	6	27.3
11 pm-1 am	13	8.1	1	6.3	11	7.7	1	4.5
1-8 am	7	4.4	-	-	4	2.8	1	4.5
No answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

(Since many students checked more than one time, percentages will add up to more than 100%.)

TABLE 28

PREFERRED VIEWING TIME FOR TV LESSON:
TAKERS VS. NON-TAKERS

When we look at the composite figures, combining all those choices between 8:00 and 4:00 (to approximate the working day), the difference between takers and non-takers is stronger, as Table 29 shows.

	Takers	Non-Takers	Total
	%	%	%
Spring 1972-73			
Consumer Economics	28.7	45.7	31.4
Geography	25.8	37.9	29.3
Psychology	23.5	35.0	27.1
Summer 1973			
Law	19.4	50.0	30.2
Fall 1973-74			
Psychology	31.7	59.1	35.4

(Responses from those who checked 8-11, and 1-4 have been been combined.)

TABLE 29

STUDENTS PREFERRING A VIEWING TIME
BETWEEN 8:00 and 4:00

Viewing preferences, then, seem to suggest that a higher percentage of those not employed full-time--perhaps those who are housewives or full-time students--do not successfully complete TV courses.

Location Where TV Lesson Was Watched

Information on where the student watched his television lesson is available for the three fall 1973-74 courses, art, consumer economics, and psychology. The lessons were broadcast over four channels at various times of day. They were also available for viewing in the media centers at both colleges.

	Art		Consumer Economics		Psychology	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Home	366	81.2	306	94.3	242	75.2
Campus	79	17.6	20	4.8	80	24.8
Friend's	1	.2	-	-	-	-
Other	2	.5	1	.2	-	-
No answer	2	.5	3	.7	-	-
Totals	450	100.0	330	100.0	322	100.0

TABLE 30

VIEWING LOCATION PREFERENCE OF TV STUDENTS, FALL, 1973-74

But one in four psychology students viewed their lessons on campus, which suggests that these were also on-campus students.

Contact With Facilitator

Although TV students, whatever course they took, seldom contacted the course facilitator, they overwhelmingly endorse the idea that one should be available. Slightly more fall than spring students contacted the facilitator.

In every class for which we have such information, a higher percentage of final exam takers contacted the course facilitator, which might be expected. See Table 31.

	Some Contact			No Contact		
	Exam Takers %	Exam Non-Takers %	Total %	Exam Takers %	Exam Non-Takers %	Total %
Spring 1972-73						
Consumer Economics	36.1	21.7	33.8	59.0	76.1	61.7
Geography	58.3	33.3	51.1	40.5	60.6	46.3
Psychology	42.9	27.0	37.9	54.8	68.0	59.0
Summer 1973						
Law	-	-	46.6	-	-	51.7
Fall 1973-74						
Art	-	-	48.4	-	-	50.0
Psychology	43.7	31.8	42.1	53.5	63.6	54.9

TABLE 31

PERCENTAGE OF TV STUDENTS
WHO CONTACTED COURSE FACILITATOR

Study Sessions

We also asked students if they had attended a study session. As more takers than non-takers contacted their facilitator, so did more takers attend such sessions.

Would Recommend Course

Fall art and psychology students were asked if they would recommend the course to someone else. Almost all indicated they would, but fewer non-takers for the psychology course were so inclined. See Table 32.

	Art		Psychology					
	Total		Takers		Non-Takers		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	116	91.1	126	88.8	16	72.7	142	86.6
No	9	7.1	6	4.2	2	9.1	8	4.9
No answer	1	.8	10	7.0	4	18.2	14	8.5
Totals	126	100.0	142	100.0	22	100.0	164	100.0

TABLE 32

WOULD TV STUDENT RECOMMEND
THE COURSE TO SOMEONE ELSE?

One of the simplest ways to assess the student's attitude toward his television course is to ask him if he would enroll in another. Most students respond that they would. This was true for a greater percentage of takers than non-takers, as Table 33 shows.

	Takers	Non-Takers	Total
	%	%	%
Spring 1972-73			
Consumer Economics	77.5	76.0	77.2
Geography	76.7	71.2	75.1
Psychology	83.4	77.0	81.4
Summer 1973			
Law	88.8	93.8	89.2
Fall 1973-74			
Art	-	-	92.0
Psychology	88.0	95.5	89.0

TABLE 33

PERCENTAGE WHO WOULD ENROLL
IN ANOTHER TV COURSE

More fall psychology students who didn't finish the course than did would take another course.

Do Television Students Become On-Campus Students?

Do students who first enroll in college in a television course then go on to take on-campus courses? We traced those who enrolled for the first time in television courses at either college in the fall of 1973-74 to see how many of them enrolled again the following semester. We realized that first-time enrollment in the TV course didn't necessarily mean that the student had not attended college elsewhere, only that this was his first appearance in this district. Although the total of such students is too small to produce reliable prediciton, the figures, shown in Table 34, do suggest a trend and are of interest.

	Total This Campus	No. 1st-time Students	No. 1st-timers Re-enrolled
			Spring 1973-74
Orange Coast College	584	11	6
Golden West College	567	33	9

TABLE 34

TV COURSE ENROLLMENT
FALL, 1973-74

Even though the enrollment in television courses was nearly equal in the two colleges, Golden West attracted three times as many first-time enrollees. Almost all of the first-time students who returned enrolled again in TV courses. Two of the OCC students enrolled in on-campus courses in the spring, one with a full schedule of 21 units, including four TV courses: Only one of the GWC students enrolled in a spring course on campus.

STUDENT EVALUATION OF TELEVISION COURSES

This part of the report examines three kinds of student evaluation: measurement in the form of a post-course questionnaire, that of a weekly Course Diary, and information obtained from student interviews conducted midway through the semester. It should be noted that none of these respondent groups are mutually exclusive, that is, an indeterminate number of students who completed the post-course evaluation also kept a Course Diary and all who completed a student interview with us maintained a diary as well.

Also included in this section of the report are enrollment and completion figures and data on grade distributions. While not a result of student evaluation, these are treated here as a measurement of students' actual achievements in the courses under consideration and can be compared with those evaluations. All of these forms of evaluation are examined in terms of the information they provide for each course and on a comparative basis where appropriate.

Post-Course Student Evaluation

Students enrolled in both the fall art and psychology courses were asked to complete a course evaluation questionnaire at the end of the semester. Of the 401 art students enrolled in that course, 126 (31.4%) completed the questionnaire, as did 142 (33.6%) of the 423 psychology students.

Students were asked to rate various aspects of the course on the following scale: (1) *bad*; (2) *poor*; (3) *adequate*; (4) *very good*; (5) *excellent*. Since the psychology questionnaire distinguished between those who took the final examination (takers) and those who did not (non-takers), we were able

to assess differences in evaluation between the two groups (Table 35). In two of every three cases, those who did not take the final exam assigned a higher rating to the measurement than did students who finished the course.

	Takers	Non-Takers	Total
TOTAL	142	22	164
1. Text	4.2	4.5	4.2
2. Syllabus	3.9	4.5	3.9
3. Amount and kind of information provided by facilitators	3.7	3.9	3.7
4. Content of exams	4.0	4.0	4.0
5. Scheduling of exams	3.8	3.3*	3.8
6. Grading procedures	3.8	3.8	3.8
7. Television lessons	4.1	4.3	4.2
8. Pace of TV lessons	3.7	4.1	3.8
9. Schedule of TV broadcasts	3.9	3.5*	3.8
10. Quality of TV reception	3.9	4.5	4.0
11. Scope and balance of information presented in TV lessons	4.1	4.2	4.1
12. Relevance of course materials for your needs	3.8	4.1	3.9
13. Visiting experts and guests in TV lessons	4.4	4.4	4.4
14. Overall academic quality	4.2	4.4	4.2
15. Rating of course compared to other courses taken	4.1	4.3	4.1
16. Course mean	-	-	4.0

* Instances of lower ratings; Scale: (1) *bad*; (2) *poor*; (3) *adequate*; (4)*very good*; (5) *excellent*.

TABLE 35

MEAN SCORES
PSYCHOLOGY POST-COURSE EVALUTION
FALL, 1973-74

The two instances in which non-finishers gave a lower rating are those referring to scheduling--of examinations and of TV lesson presentations. This

tends to suggest that these students did not finish the course because of mechanical, i.e. scheduling difficulties rather than a particular problem with, say, the course content. However, since the *non-taker* sample population for the fall, 1973-74 television course is only 8 percent of the 276 students who did not complete the course, its evaluations cannot be construed as representative.

Parallel measurement for psychology during the preceding spring semester shows somewhat the opposite situation: Those who did not take the final examination assigned a lower rating to two-thirds of the measurements requested (Table 36).

	Takers	Non-Takers	Total
TOTAL	217	100	317
1. Text	3.9	4.0	3.9
2. Syllabus	4.0	3.8	3.9
3. Amount and kind of information provided by facilitator	3.8	3.5	3.7
4. Content of exams	3.7	3.4	3.6
5. Scheduling of exams	3.7	3.2	3.5
6. Grading procedure	4.0	3.5	3.8
7. TV lessons	4.9	3.8	3.9
8. Pace of TV lessons	3.8	3.5	3.7
9. Schedule of TV broadcasts	3.8	3.3	3.6
10. Quality of TV reception	4.0	3.8	3.9
11. Scope and balance of information presented in TV lessons	3.8	3.9	3.8
12. Relevance of course materials for your needs	-	-	-
13. Visiting experts and guests in TV lessons	4.3	4.3	4.3
14. Overall academic quality	4.0	4.0	4.0
15. Rating of course compared to other courses taken	4.0	3.9	4.0
16. Course mean	-	-	3.8

Scale: (1) *bad*; (2) *poor*; (3) *adequate*; (4) *very good*; (5) *excellent*.

TABLE 36

MEAN SCORES
PSYCHOLOGY POST-COURSE EVALUATION
SPRING, 1972-73

One hundred students who did not complete the course provided us with information: They constituted 32 percent of all those failing to complete Psychology 100 for spring, 1973-74. And, as the table shows, this *non-taker* population assigned for lower rating to the more academic charateristics of the course: the TV lesson itself, the exam content, and the pace of the lessons. In short, the picture for spring seems to be the more usual or traditional one: Some students have trouble with some aspect(s) of the course, enough so that they do not complete it. It would seem to follow that a student would not assign a superior rating to something at which he was not successful.

In the History of Art post-course evaluation there was no attempt to distinguish between exam-takers and non-takers: The questionnaires were mailed to every student enrolled in the course. Thirty-one percent (126 students) returned the questionnaire. Table 37 shows the evaluations.

		Mean
1.	Text	4.1
2.	Syllabus	4.4
3.	Amount and kind of information provided by facilitator	3.8
4.	Content of exams	3.8
5.	Scheduling of exams	3.8
6.	Grading procedure	3.8
7.	TV lessons	3.9
8.	Pace of TV lessons	3.8
9.	Schedule of broadcasts	4.1
10.	Quality of TV reception	4.2
11.	Scope and balance of information presented in TV lessons	4.0
12.	Relevance of course materials for your needs	3.8
13.	Visiting experts and guests in TV lessons	4.0
14.	Overall academic quality	4.0
15.	Rating of course compared to other courses taken	3.8
16.	Course mean	4.0

Scale: (1) *bad*; (2) *poor*; (3) *adequate*; (4) *very good*; (5) *excellent*

TABLE 37

MEAN SCORES: HISTORY OF ART POST-COURSE EVALUATION, FALL, 1973-74

Course Diary

We were interested in discovering whether or not there would be any significant difference between the post-course student evaluation and those of the students maintaining the Course Diaries. The former, of course, inquired about various aspects of the course overall, whereas the Course Diary assigned a rating to several aspects of each lesson. Tables 44 through 48 show the mean scores for these course aspects on a lesson-by-lesson basis.

Psychology

In those cases in which the data were strictly comparable (Table 38), we discovered that the psychology students keeping the Course Diary assigned a slightly higher rating to the course overall.

	Course Diary Evaluations	Post-Course Evaluations
1. Text	4.1	4.2
2. Syllabus	4.0	3.9
3. Pace of TV lesson	4.0	3.8
4. Scope and balance of information presented in TV lesson	4.1	4.1
5. Experts and guests in TV lessons	4.4	4.4
6. Overall academic quality	4.1	4.2
7. Course mean	4.1	4.0

Scale: (1) *bad*; (2) *poor*; (3) *adequate*; (4) *very good*; (5) *excellent*

TABLE 38

COMPARISON OF COURSE DIARY EVALUATIONS
AND POST-COURSE STUDENT EVALUATIONS
PSYCHOLOGY, FALL, 1973-74

The Course Diary form did solicit information on a lesson-by-lesson basis not asked for in the post-course evaluation. This is shown in Table 39.

	Mean
Content of television presentation	4.2
Relevance of television presentation to course	4.2
Technical quality of television presentation	4.2

Scale: (1) *bad*; (2) *poor*; (3) *adequate*; (4) *very good*; (5) *excellent*

TABLE 39

MEAN SCORES
PSYCHOLOGY COURSE DIARY EVALUATION
FALL, 1973-74

History of Art

Thirty-seven students, constituting 9.2 percent of the total enrollment for History of Art, maintained a Course Diary. Their course evaluation, on a lesson-by-lesson basis (Table 40), reflected a lower mean rating than did that of the post-course evaluation where the data was strictly comparable.

	Course Diary Evaluations	Post-Course Evaluations
1. Text	3.4	4.1
2. Syllabus	3.8	4.4
3. Pace of TV lesson	3.8	3.8
4. Scope and balance of information presented in TV lesson	4.0	4.0
5. Experts and guests in TV lessons	3.5	4.0
6. Overall academic quality	3.8	3.9
7. Course mean	3.8	4.0

Scale: (1) *bad*; (2) *poor*; (3) *adequate*; (4) *very good*; (5) *excellent*

TABLE 40

COMPARISON OF COURSE DIARY EVALUATIONS AND POST-COURSE STUDENT EVALUATIONS, HISTORY OF ART, FALL, 1973-74

Table 41 shows information elicited from Course Diary forms only.

	Mean
Content of television presentation	4.1
Relevance of TV presentation to course	4.0
Technical quality of TV presentation	3.7

Scale: (1) *bad*; (2) *poor*; (3) *adequate*; (4) *very good*; (5) *excellent*

TABLE 41

MEAN SCORES
COURSE DIARY EVALUATION
HISTORY OF ART, FALL, 1973-74

Consumer Contest

The thirty students who maintained a weekly record of evaluation for The Great Consumer Contest assigned the course the ratings shown in Table 42.

		Mean
1.	Content of television presentation	3.7
2.	Pace of television presentation	3.6
3.	Relevance of TV presentation to course	3.9
4.	Text readings	3.7
5.	Syllabus readings	3.5
6.	Technical quality of TV presentation	3.8
7.	Scope and balance of information presented in lessons	3.6
8.	Visiting experts and guests in TV presentation	3.7
9.	Overall academic quality	3.6
10.	Course mean	3.7

Scale: (1) *bad*; (2) *poor*; (3) *adequate*; (4) *very good*; (5) *excellent*

TABLE 42

MEAN SCORES
COURSE DIARY EVALUATION
CONSUMER CONTEST, FALL, 1973-74

Although we have no post-course evaluation for the fall 1973-74 economics course--nor do we have a Course Diary evaluation from the previous, spring--

we can compare the mean ratings assigned the other two television courses broadcast during fall, 1973-74. This is done in Table 43. In all criteria but those of the textbook, the technical quality of the course, and the visiting experts, economics was ranked the lowest.

	A Content	B Pace	C Relevance	D Text	E Syllabus	F Tech.	G Scope	H Guests	J Academic	Course Mean
Psych.	4.23	3.96	4.18	4.05	4.00	4.20	4.13	4.37	4.10	4.12
Art	4.10	3.80	3.98	3.42	3.77	3.74	3.89	3.54	4.06	3.83
Econ.	3.73	3.57	3.94	3.69	3.52	3.77	3.59	3.72	3.62	3.67

Scale: (1) *bad*; (2) *poor*; (3) *adequate*; (4) *very good*; (5) *excellent*

TABLE 43

COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES
FOR FALL, 1973-74
TELEVISION COURSES

Reasons for the lower ranking, as well as those for the means assigned other factors for the fall television courses, are explored in some detail in the section of this report entitled *TV Student Interviews*.

Course Diary Lesson Analysis

As a means of identifying those lessons* within each course which were rated substantially above and below average by the Course Diary students, a criterion interval was established for each of the ten evaluation criterion. The interval was set as one standard deviation above and below the mean course evaluation score for that criterion. For example, the overall student evaluation for criterion 3 (*relevance of television presentation to course*) for

* Titles of each lesson are given in full in Appendices 9, 10, and 11.

the psychology course in the fall, 1973-74 semester is 4.18. The standard deviation for criterion three is 0.24. We take the interval at 4.18 $\pm$ 0.24, that is, from 3.94 to 4.42. All lesson evaluation scores falling outside that interval are considered to be sufficiently better or worse than the average score to warrant attention. Tables 44 through 48 show the results. A "+" indicates a score above the criterion range; a "-" a score below.

The only striking examples of lesson evaluations which fall outside the established criterion intervals are to be found in the psychology course. As shown in Table 44, lesson 21, "Defense Mechanisms" was rated consistently high: nine of ten criteria have scores higher than their established intervals. The lesson immediately following, "Neuroses," reflects the opposite situation: eight of the ten criteria were rated below the established levels. While it is interesting to speculate on possible reasons which underlie these contrasting evaluations, no answers are readily available.

When combining several criteria to form more general evaluation scales, the mean scores for each criterion were added together. The standard deviation for the resulting aggregate scale is calculated by summing the variances of each criterion included in the scale and then taking the square root of the sum. We designated two categories of this type: one which contained aspects of the lesson itself (*TV Lesson Criteria*) and one which included materials supplementing the lesson (*Reading Criteria*). Tables 47 and 48 show the results.

Lesson Number	Sample Number	(A) Content of TV Presentation	(B) Pace of TV Presentation	(C) Relevance of TV Presentation to Course	(D) Text Readings for Lesson	(E) Syllabus Readings for Course
1-8	No response					
9	6	4.50	3.83	4.17	3.67	4.00
10	6	4.50	3.83	4.17	4.17	4.00
11	16	3.82-	3.36	4.09	3.82	3.36-
12	11	4.27	3.02	4.27	4.00	3.64-
13	13	3.85-	3.77	3.92-	3.02	3.77
14	13	4.23	4.00	4.32	3.92	3.77
15	14	4.29	4.14	4.29	4.29	3.86
16	16	4.31	4.06	4.19	4.37	3.87
17	11	4.27	3.82	4.00	4.00	4.18
18	13	3.54-	3.17-	3.85-	4.08	3.85
19	17	4.24	4.29	4.00	4.00	4.06
20	16	4.12	4.19	3.87+	4.13	4.07
21	16	4.69+	4.62+	4.69+	4.62+	4.56+
22	17	3.88-	2.71-	4.07	3.82	3.29-
23	14	4.14	3.86	4.36	4.21	4.07
24	10	4.33	4.00	4.33	4.22	4.50+
25	14	4.50	4.43	4.46+	4.00	4.17
26	11	4.44	4.06	4.07	4.12	3.92
27	11	4.36	4.36	4.55+	3.87	3.89
28	12	4.58	4.42	4.50	4.14	4.20
29	10	3.60-	3.90	3.80-	3.78	3.89
30	11	4.45	4.55	4.00	3.60-	4.20
31	11	4.18	3.50-	4.36	4.09	4.09
32	11	4.18	4.00	4.18	4.27	4.18
33	7	4.57	4.43	4.43+	4.71+	4.86+
34	9	4.33	4.11	4.11	4.11	4.22
35	8	4.00	3.50-	3.75	3.40-	3.67
Criterion Range		3.94 - 4.62	3.53 - 4.35	3.94 - 4.42	3.76 - 4.34	3.67 - 4.33

Table 44 continued on next page.

Lesson Number	Sample Number	(F) Tech. Quality of TV Presentation	(G) Scope and Balance of Info. Presented in TV Lesson	(H) Visiting Experts and Guests in TV Presentation	(I) Rating of Lesson Compared with Others in Course	(J) Overall Academic Quality of Lesson
1-8	No response					
9	6	4.17	4.17	4.67+	4.17	4.00
10	6	4.33	4.17	4.20	4.17	4.17
11	16	3.56-	3.91-	4.00-	3.45-	3.73-
12	11	4.18	4.18	4.73+	4.18	4.00
13	13	4.38	4.00	4.23	3.69	3.92
14	13	4.23	4.46+	4.54	4.15	4.15
15	14	4.36	4.21	4.57	4.21	4.14
16	16	4.31	4.25	4.44	3.87	4.07
17	11	4.45	4.00	4.09-	3.91	4.18
18	13	3.69-	3.62-	4.00-	3.38-	3.77-
19	17	4.35	4.12	4.35	4.12	4.12
20	16	4.25	3.94	4.19	3.94	3.81
21	16	4.75+	4.44+	4.54	4.44+	4.62+
22	17	3.94-	3.88-	3.82-	3.12-	3.65-
23	14	4.21	4.14	4.36	3.93	4.21
24	10	4.33	4.22	4.44	4.11	4.33
25	14	4.14	4.29	4.50	4.21	4.36+
26	11	4.12-	4.37+	4.31	4.19	4.19
27	11	4.09	4.36+	4.64+	4.45	4.55+
28	12	4.50	4.33+	4.33	4.33+	4.42+
29	10	4.00-	4.00	4.00	3.60-	3.70-
30	11	4.36	4.00	4.55	4.20	4.00
31	11	3.90-	4.20	4.45	3.82	4.10
32	11	4.00-	3.80-	4.18	3.91	4.18
33	7	4.71+	4.29	4.43	4.29	4.29
34	9	3.89-	4.11	4.78	4.33+	4.11
35	8	4.12-	4.00	4.62+	3.75	3.87+
Criterion Range		3.94 - 4.62	3.53 - 4.35	3.94 - 4.42	3.76 - 4.34	3.67 - 4.33

Scale: (1) *bad*; (2) *poor*; (3) *adequate*; (4) *very good*; (5) *excellent*

TABLE 44

MEAN SCORES; LESSON ANALYSIS
PSYCHOLOGY, FALL, 1973-74

Lesson Number	Sample Number	(A) Content of TV Presentation	(B) Pace of TV Presentation	(C) Relevance of TV Presentation to Course	(D) Text Readings for Lesson	(E) Syllabus Readings for Course
1-12	No response					
13	7	3.71	3.57-	3.86	3.00	4.14
14	6	3.83	3.67	4.00	3.33	4.33+
15	6	4.33	3.83	4.00	2.80-	4.00
16	11	4.09	3.82	3.01	3.36	3.64
17	10	3.90	3.80	4.00	3.56	3.80
18	10	3.90	3.50-	3.80	3.50	3.70
19	10	3.90	3.50-	3.80	3.50	3.70
20	19	3.89	3.63	4.11	3.37	3.89
21	19	3.74-	3.58-	3.89	3.11	3.84
22	19	4.16	3.58-	4.00	3.32	3.89
23	19	4.11	3.63	3.95	3.42	3.88
24	23	4.22	3.78	4.09	3.68	4.10
25	16	4.00	3.81	3.94	3.40	4.00
26	17	4.20	3.71	4.00	3.80	3.75
27	16	4.44+	4.19	4.19	4.00+	4.00
28	16	4.12	3.69	3.69	3.43	3.87
29	16	4.06	3.81	3.60	3.40	3.80
30	20	3.88	3.76	3.62	3.75	3.85
31	22	3.90	3.73	3.82	3.57	3.57
32	17	3.62-	3.47	3.47-	3.31	3.00-
33	17	3.81-	3.59	3.59	3.44	3.96
34	18	3.89	3.83	3.83	3.71	3.81
35	16	4.13	4.00+	4.12	3.67	3.81
36	17	4.19	4.12+	4.06	3.76	3.94
37	16	3.94	3.75	4.00	4.00+	3.00-
38	14	3.93	3.71	3.71	3.91	3.21-
39	12	4.08	3.92	3.75	3.50	3.42
40	9	4.22	3.89	3.56	3.00	3.67
41	11	4.10	3.82	4.10	3.62	4.12
42	13	4.23	3.77	4.62+	4.00+	4.45+
Criterion Range		3.81 - 4.39	3.62 - 3.98	3.64 - 4.32	2.90 - 3.94	3.31 - 4.23

Table 45 continued on next page.

Lesson Number	Sample Number	(F) Tech. Quality of TV Presentation	(G) Scope and Balance of Info. Presented in TV Lesson	(H) Visiting Experts and Guests in TV Presentation	(I) Rating of Lesson Compared with Others in Course	(J) Overall Academic Quality of Lesson
1-12	No response					
13	7	3.71	3.43	1.00-	3.29-	4.00
14	6	3.83	4.17+	1.00-	3.67	4.33+
15	6	4.00	4.00	0.00-	4.00	4.60
16	11	3.91	3.73	3.00	3.73	3.91
17	10	4.00	4.00	4.29	3.90	4.00
18	10	3.80	3.80	2.50-	3.70	3.90
19	10	3.80	3.80	2.50-	3.70	3.90
20	19	3.63	3.74	2.33-	3.47	3.74
21	19	3.63	3.74	2.00-	3.42	3.58-
22	19	3.63	3.68	3.00	3.89	4.00
23	19	3.79	3.95	0.00	3.89	4.00
24	23	3.57	3.78	4.50	4.04	4.04
25	16	3.50	3.56	0.00	3.87	3.81
26	17	3.71	3.47-	0.00	3.65	3.82
27	16	4.06	3.93	4.67+	4.31+	4.25
28	16	3.69	3.69	4.00	3.69	3.94
29	16	3.62	3.94	0.00	3.93	4.00
30	20	3.85	3.76	4.36	3.94	4.06
31	22	3.50	3.82	4.00	3.86	3.91
32	17	3.53	3.50-	3.12	3.00-	3.44-
33	17	3.41	3.71	3.70	3.65	3.82
34	18	3.61	3.72	3.00	4.00	4.06
35	16	3.81	3.87	4.00	4.07	4.19
36	17	3.88	3.94	4.18	4.19	4.24
37	16	3.50	3.94	3.86	3.87	4.07
38	14	3.71	4.07	4.00	4.07	4.08
39	12	3.67	4.17+	4.12	4.00	4.00
40	9	3.56	3.89	4.00+	3.56	3.67-
41	11	3.30	4.10	4.00+	3.90	4.20
42	13	3.77	4.15+	5.00+	4.15	4.31
Criterion Range		3.33 - 4.15	3.65 - 4.13	2.41 - 4.61	3.54 - 4.25	3.74 - 4.38

Scale: (1) *bad*; (2) *poor*; (3) *adequate*; (4) *very good*; (5) *excellent*

TABLE 45

MEAN SCORES; LESSON ANALYSIS, HISTORY OF ART, FALL, 1973-74

Lesson Number	Sample Number	(A) Content of TV Presentation	(B) Pace of TV Presentation	(C) Relevance of TV Presentation to Course	(D) Text Readings for Lesson	(E) Syllabus Readings for Course
1-18	No response					
19	18	3.67	3.56	4.28+	4.00+	3.73
20	16	3.81	3.47	4.19+	3.93	4.00
21	13	3.54	3.62	3.92	4.00	3.70
22	20	3.95+	3.60	4.20+	3.72	3.78
23	17	3.71	3.59	3.94	3.87	4.00
24	18	3.44	3.33-	3.56	3.92	3.59
25	19	3.68	3.42	3.84	3.22-	3.28
26	6	3.33	3.67	4.00	3.50	2.75
27	19	3.63	3.42	3.74	3.36-	3.72
28	16	3.81	3.50	3.75	3.18-	3.67
29	13	3.77	3.77+	3.92	3.20-	3.67
30	15	3.60	3.40	3.73	3.09-	2.93
31	14	3.93+	3.71	3.86	3.42	3.38
32	13	4.00	3.69	4.25+	4.00+	3.92
33	13	3.69	3.38-	3.92	3.73	3.17
34	17	3.59	3.29-	3.47	3.54	2.87
35	16	3.56	3.50	3.44	3.58	3.43
36	15	3.80	3.60	4.00	3.77	3.54
37	15	3.87	3.47	3.93	3.62	3.64
38	15	3.69	3.56	3.80	3.85	3.73
39	13	3.69	3.69	3.92	4.20+	4.08+
40	12	3.67	3.42	3.83	4.00+	3.50
41	19	3.89+	3.63	3.84	3.67	3.29
42	15	3.73	3.60	3.93	3.73	3.43
43	14	4.07	3.57	4.14	3.50	3.33
44	14	3.79	3.69	4.15	3.92	3.46
45	15	3.69	3.54	3.92	3.82	3.50
Criterion Range		3.59 - 3.92	3.37 - 3.77	3.69 - 4.19	3.40 - 3.78	3.16 - 3.99

Table 46 continued on next page.

Lesson Number	Sample Number	(F) Tech. Quality of TV Presentation	(G) Scope and Balance of Info. Presented in TV Lesson	(H) Visiting Experts and Guests in TV Presentation	(I) Rating of Lesson Compared with Others in Course	(J) Overall Academic Quality of Lesson
1-18	No response					
19	18	4.00+	3.56	0.00	3.39	3.67
20	16	4.87	3.81+	0.00	3.75	3.94+
21	13	3.83	3.62	4.00	3.62	3.62
22	20	3.90	3.63	0.00	3.60	3.75
23	17	3.71	3.62	0.00	3.47	3.75
24	18	3.72	3.12-	0.00	3.33	3.33-
25	19	3.74	3.53	0.00	3.68	3.53
26	6	3.67	3.50	0.00	3.33	3.33-
27	19	4.00	3.58	0.00	3.68	3.53
28	16	3.75	3.44	3.00-	3.37	3.37-
29	13	3.92	3.69	0.00	3.54	3.62
30	15	3.53	3.47	0.00	3.40	3.07-
31	14	3.71	3.36	4.00	3.64	3.71
32	13	3.62	4.00+	4.23	4.08	3.92+
33	13	3.62	3.54	0.00	3.77	3.75
34	17	3.59	3.47	0.00	3.35	3.37
35	16	3.56	3.31-	0.00	3.50	3.53
36	15	3.87	3.73	0.00	3.60	3.60
37	15	3.73	3.73	0.00	3.87	3.53
38	15	3.69	3.47	2.89	3.56	3.37-
39	13	3.46	3.77	3.00	3.84	3.46
40	12	2.75	3.58	0.00	3.67	3.50
41	19	3.53-	3.74	0.00	3.53	3.63
42	15	3.93	3.67	3.85	3.60	3.73
43	14	3.86	4.00+	4.43+	3.93+	3.71
44	14	4.00+	3.86+	4.09	3.92	3.71
45	15	4.15+	3.54	0.00	3.69	3.92+
Criterion Range		3.60 - 3.94	3.39 - 3.79	3.13 - 4.31	3.32 - 3.98	3.37 - 3.87

Scale: (1) *bad*; (2) *poor*; (3) *adequate*; (4) *very good*; (5) *excellent*

TABLE 46

MEAN SCORES; LESSON ANALYSIS; CONSUMER CONTEST, FALL, 1973-74

Lesson Number	Consumer Economics	History of Art	Psychology
1-5 (Data not recorded)			
6	0.00	5.00-	0.00
7	0.00	5.00-	0.00
8	0.00	5.00-	0.00
9	0.00	8.50+	7.67
10	0.00	9.00+	8.17
11	0.00	8.00+	7.18+
12	0.00	7.50	7.64
13	0.00	7.14	7.69
14	0.00	7.67	7.69
15	0.00	6.80	8.14
16	8.25+	7.00	8.25
17	7.00	7.36	8.18
18	6.50-	7.20	7.93
19	7.73+	7.20	8.06
20	7.93+	7.26	8.20
21	7.70+	6.95	9.19+
22	7.50	7.20	8.29
23	7.87+	7.30	8.29
24	7.50	7.78	8.72+
25	6.50-	7.40	8.17
26	6.25-	7.55	8.04
27	7.08	8.00+	7.76
28	6.85	7.30	8.34
29	6.87	7.20	7.67
30	6.02-	7.38	7.80
31	6.80	7.14	8.18
32	7.92+	6.31-	8.45
33	6.89	6.50-	9.57+
34	6.41-	7.52	8.33
35	7.01	7.48	7.07-
36	7.31	7.70	0.00
37	7.26	7.00	0.00
38	7.58	7.12	0.00
39	8.28+	6.92	0.00
40	7.50	6.67	0.00
41	6.96	7.75	0.00
42	7.16	8.45-	0.00
43 (Data not recorded)			

TABLE 47

READING COMPONENTS: TEXT AND SYLLABUS
TELEVISION LESSONS, FALL, 1973-74

Lesson Number	Consumer Economics	History of Art	Psychology
1-5 (Data not recorded)			
6	00.00	16.00	00.00
7	00.00	16.00	00.00
8	00.00	16.00	00.00
9	00.00	16.50+	16.50
10	00.00	18.00+	16.70
11	00.00	18.50+	14.80-
12	00.00	17.50+	16.40
13	00.00	14.70-	15.50-
14	00.00	16.00	16.80
15	00.00	16.80+	16.80
16	16.50+	15.50	16.70
17	13.20-	15.70	16.30
18	15.00+	15.10-	14.10-
19	14.40	15.10-	16.80
20	15.00+	15.00-	16.10
21	14.40	14.60-	18.40+
22	14.90	15.40	14.10-
23	14.70	15.70	16.40
24	13.20-	15.80	16.90
25	14.20	15.20-	17.60+
26	13.80-	15.20-	17.10+
27	14.20	16.80+	17.60+
28	14.10	15.40	17.70+
29	14.80	15.80	15.20-
30	13.50-	15.80	17.00
31	14.70	15.40	16.00
32	15.60+	14.00-	16.20
33	14.40	14.90-	17.60+
34	13.70-	15.50	16.70
35	13.90-	16.20	15.40-
36	14.70	16.50+	00.00
37	14.60	15.70	00.00
38	14.10	15.80	00.00
39	14.60	16.20	00.00
40	14.20	15.70	00.00
41	14.90	16.20	00.00
42	14.70	16.50+	00.00
43	15.40+	00.00	00.00
44	15.00+	00.00	00.00
45	14.70	00.00	00.00

TABLE 48

TV LESSON COMPONENTS:
CONTENT, PACE, SCOPE AND BALANCE, OVERALL ACADEMIC QUALITY
TELEVISION LESSONS, FALL, 1973-74

Completion Rates and Grade Distribution

Psychology

When the course completion rates for spring, 1972-73 and fall, 1973-74 television psychology students were compared with those of day and evening on-campus students during the same semesters, we found that, whereas enrollment and completion rates rose for on-campus students, both factors showed a decrease for the television students (Table 49).

Psychology 100

On-Campus Students	Total Registration	Total Completion	
	No.	No.	%
Spring, 1972-73 (day college)	1,871	943	50.4
Spring, 1972-73 (evening college)	784	569	72.6
Fall, 1973-74 (day college)	2,979	1,564	52.5
Fall, 1973-74 (evening college)	710	442	62.3
Television Students			
Spring, 1972-73	519	207	39.9
Fall, 1973-74	423	147	34.8

TABLE 49

COMPARISON OF COMPLETION RATES
FOR PSYCHOLOGY STUDENTS

A comparison of the grade distributions (Table 50) shows that both on-campus day students and television students enrolled in psychology who took the course during fall, 1973-74, did less well than those the preceding spring. Over 11 percent of the fall on-campus day students received a grade above "C" compared with 16.5 percent who did the semester before. Of the fall television

students who elected to take the course on a credit/non-credit basis: 45.6 percent compared with 18.4 percent the previous spring.

Academic performance as indicated by grade distribution for evening college students, however, reflects the opposite situation: 46.4 percent of the fall, 1973-74 students received a grade above "C" compared with 30.1 percent the preceding spring.

On-Campus Students	N	A	B	C	D	F	Credit
Spring 1972-73 (day college)*	1,871	8.9	7.6	8.4	2.1	-	73.0
Spring 1972-73 (eve. college)	784	9.7	20.4	20.0	3.5	4.7	41.7
Fall 1973-74 (day college)	2,979	4.2	7.3	8.6	2.5	-	77.4
Fall 1973-74 (eve. college)**	710	12.0	34.4	29.9	1.3	-	22.4
Television Students							
Spring, 1972-73	519	14.4	27.1	37.2	1.9	-	18.4
Fall, 1973-74	423	18.4	15.6	20.4	-	-	45.6

TABLE 50

PERCENTAGE GRADE DISTRIBUTION
PSYCHOLOGY

---

* ** For Both spring, 1972-73 and fall, 1973-74 semesters, on-campus day students enrolled in Psychology 100 at Orange Coast took the course for credit/no-credit only. The grade distributions shown on Table 50 were obtained by combining enrollment figures from both campuses and taking the percentage of grades earned against the total. The percentages of credit earned were obtained by calculating this percentage from each college and combining them.

History of Art

Table 51 shows grade distributions of the History of Art course. While the percentage of TV students who completed the course was higher than that for the fall psychology students (44.9% vs. 34.8%), it is considerably lower than that of on-campus day students enrolled in the same course: 44.9 percent compared with 61.2 percent. The data for evening on-campus students, however, corresponds more closely to that of the TV class.

On-Campus Students	Total Registration	Total Completion	
	No.	No.	%
Fall, 1973-74 (day college)	301	187	62.1
Fall, 1973-74 (evening college)	67	33	49.3
Television Students			
Fall, 1973-74	401	180	44.9

TABLE 51

COMPARISON OF COMPLETION RATES
FOR HISTORY OF ART STUDENTS

Examination of the grade distribution for students in the course show that, compared with on-campus students, the television students received fewer grades above the level of "C" (Table 52). Forty-five percent of those in the television course did so as compared with 64 percent of the on-campus day college students. The performance of evening college on-campus students--again--resembled more closely that of the TV students: 51.5 percent received a grade above "C."

On-Campus Students	A	B	C	D	F	Credit
Fall, 1973-74 (day college)	19.3	44.9	33.7	2.1	-	-
Fall, 1973-74 (evening college)	9.1	42.4	21.2	-	-	27.3
Television Students						
Fall, 1973-74	16.7	28.3	29.4	16.7	-	8.9

TABLE 52

PERCENTAGE GRADE DISTRIBUTION
HISTORY OF ART

The Great Consumer Contest

Although fewer students enrolled in The Great Consumer Contest course than in any other--both spring and fall--and although there were fewer students in the fall TV class than there were for the preceding semester, the completion rate rose slightly in the fall (Table 53). This is in contrast to the TV course, psychology, which had a lower completion rate as well as a lower registration figure in the fall. The Great Consumer Contest has not only had the highest completion rate of any TV course offered to date, but is the only TV course which has had a completion rate at all comparable to its on-campus equivalent.

On-Campus Students	Total Registration	Total Completion	
	No.	No.	%
Spring, 1972-73 (day college)	158	97	61.4
Fall, 1973-74 (day college)	94	58	61.7
Television Students			
Spring, 1972-73	463	267	57.7
Fall, 1973-74	327	190	58.1

TABLE 53

COMPARISON OF COMPLETION RATES FOR CONSUMER CONTEST

The picture shown by the grade distribution for The Great Consumer Contest course, however, is quite different, as seen in Table 54. For both on-campus and TV students, the percentage of those who received a grade above "C" was lower in the fall than for the preceding spring. Eighty-one percent of the spring on-campus students received a grade above "C" compared to 67 percent of the fall students. The pattern was the same for the TV students--42.3 percent (spring) vs. 35.3 percent lastfall--where the grade distribution shows a greater concentration in the middle or "C" range in comparison to that for the on-campus class.

On-Campus Students	A	B	C	D	F	Credit
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Spring, 1972-73 (day college)	45.5	36.0	18.6	-	-	-
Fall, 1973-74 (day college)	22.4	44.8	29.3	-	-	3.5
Television Students						
Spring, 1972-73	11.6	30.7	46.1	11.2	-	-
Fall, 1973-74	13.7	21.6	34.7	1.1	-	28.9

TABLE 54

PERCENTAGE GRADE DISTRIBUTION
CONSUMER CONTEST

The data obtained, then, on consumer economics, offer a picture of the course not readily definable. As noted earlier (Table 43), it received the lowest mean scores of any television course. Academic performance on the part of its students was lower in the fall than for previous spring. And yet there is the relatively high completion rate.

* * * * * * *

Information gathered from registration and completion figures, along with that on grade distributions show that for television courses overall, enrollment is down: A total of 1,388 TV students registered in the spring, 1972-73 compared with 1,151 the following fall semester. The rate of completion for TV courses was down as well: 46.1 percent in the spring vs. 44.9 percent the following semester. The level of academic achievement fell also: 43.6 percent of all spring, 1972-73 TV students earned a grade above "C" and 38.1 percent of the fall, 1973-74 TV student population did so. Completion rates for the courses having television counterparts fell, however, from 57.9 in spring, 1973 to 55.0 percent the following semester.

This information presents a contrast in one respect when compared with the on-campus counterparts of the television courses: On-campus enrollment rose in the fall, 1973-74 from 3,003 the previous spring to 4,151 reflecting the general trend on both campuses for the same period.

TV Student Interviews

We interviewed a total of 51 students enrolled in fall, 1973-74 television courses. The majority of them (73%) were women as shown in Table 55. All of those interviewed, it will be remembered, were drawn from the same populations which kept the Course Diaries throughout the semester.

Course	Women	Men
Art	18	4
Economics	9	7
Psychology	10	3
Totals	37	14

TABLE 55

TELEVISION STUDENT INTERVIEWS

Though the students ranged in age from a high school senior to a woman in her seventies--"I wanted something to push me a little; I haven't been in school since I graduated high school in 1918"--most were in their twenties and thirties, and living with husband or wife.

These students are highly motivated; they want to complete their courses successfully and receive credit. Three-fourths of them are working toward a degree or certificate, and their comments and criticisms reflect this concern. Most (41) are taking other on-campus courses and many also work full-time. Hence, their "free time" is quite limited, and their daily TV viewing averages two hours or less.

For over half (32) of the students it was their first television course. As the interviewing went on, it became apparent that their concern is not only with quality and effectiveness of the TV presentation itself, but with the overall course program, syllabus, text and study guide, number and quality of review sessions, and the degree of coordination among them--in short, the whole package. In fact, in response to question twelve, *What do you think can be done to improve television instruction?*, more comments deal with the latter facets than with the television presentation itself.

TV students often tie their general comments and criticisms to experiences in their current classes, and we encouraged them to be as specific as possible. Through their candid--sometimes remarkably so--commentary, certain themes emerge.

The majority of students in all three classes felt the material was presented too rapidly to assimilate easily. They suggested various solutions

to the problem--from a slower pace to extending the time allotted for lessons. Some chose the alternative of watching lessons more than once.

All agreed on the importance of review sessions and seminars whether they were able to attend or not. Most wanted more and at more varied times. Art students felt the lack of a review session prior to the mid-term, and students in all the courses felt free to evaluate sessions attended in terms of timing, content, and even the personalities of the facilitators involved.

Some wished for additional quizzes and specific instructions on "how to study." These things all reflect a concern, evinced by most, for tangible kinds of measurement in order to be aware of their progress or lack thereof.

Some suggestions by TV students seem particularly valid. They wished to see, for example, lesson titles and numbers repeated at some point during each lesson. (TV guides do not furnish this information.) Some students had difficulty obtaining needed course materials, the syllabi in particular. Perhaps these could be prepaid and available by return mail as a part of registration for television courses.

Students suggested, as part of their widespread interest in and concern with review sessions, that the reviews be taped and aired in lieu of the practice of repeating a week's lessons during, say, Christmas and Easter vacations. Information necessary in selecting content of taped reviews is available from various sources: on-campus review sessions, student interviews, and Course Diaries.

While most of the students interviewed rated the letter sent by the course facilitator at the beginning of the course as *very helpful*, those

who found it less so indicated by their comments that this form of communication can be very important in eliminating sources of students' frustration and concern. Some examples: give testing dates, emphasize use of syllabus, perhaps include a brief explanation of its function and use.

We noted, too, that while over half (32) the students had not individually contacted their facilitators, nearly all felt the opportunity to do so was important. Because some students did not find their facilitator to be easily available, perhaps more facilitators should specify the times they are accessible.

Students are well aware of the lack of opportunity for feedback, discussion, and interchange in this method of learning. Indeed, part of their interest in review sessions came from the feeling that such gatherings could partially supply these elements. Nevertheless, they are all enthusiastic in varying degrees about television as a way of learning. It is convenient, it allows them to plan their own viewing and study schedules, and to learn at their own pace.

Following are student comments and impressions which refer to specific courses. Table 56 shows the tallied responses to the questions contained in the interview form.

	No.	%
1. Reason for taking a TV course*		
Interest in course	3	4.5
Convenience	32	48.4
Need units	19	28.9
Interest in medium of presentation	5	7.6
Job advancement or promotion	-	-
Other	7	10.6

Table 56 is continued on next page.

*Multiple answers were accepted if student so defined himself.

	No.	%
2. Initial experience in a TV course		
Yes	32	62.7
No	19	37.3
Law (summer, 1973)	7	-
Psychology (spring, 1973)	6	-
Astronomy (spring, 1973)	4	-
Consumer economics (spring, 1973)	2	-
Geography (spring, 1973)	7	-
3. Way in which student first learned about the course in which he is enrolled		
TV announcement	2	3.9
Radio announcement	-	-
Newspaper	3	5.9
Brochure picked up on campus	12	23.5
Brochure picked up off campus	1	2.0
Schedule of classes	15	29.4
Other:		
Mail	5	-
Channel 50 Newsletter	2	-
Watching other program	2	-
Friend	3	-
Asked around campus	2	-
Remembered from last year	1	-
Called college	1	-
Flipping the dial	1	-
Can't remember	1	-
4. Class in which respondent is enrolled		
History of Art	22	43.1
The Great Consumer Contest	16	31.4
As Man Behaves	13	25.5
5. Is respondent presently enrolled in other on-campus courses?		
Yes	41	80.4
No	10	19.6
6. Rating of instructor's letter		
Very helpful	34	66.7

-Listed each lecture, subject.
-Broke down times.
-Listed facilitator's schedule.
-Can plan own schedule ahead.
-Can do all by mail; no standing in lines.

6. continued	No.	%
Helpful but left out information	9	17.6
-Didn't explain text, use of study guide.		
-Didn't emphasize how much syllabus is needed.		
-Review time changed--no notice.		
-Indicated seminar; didn't follow through.		
Wasn't helpful	5	9.9
-Way too long.		
-Art just a short blur; no help.		

7. Contact with the course facilitator		
Yes	19	37.3
By telephone	16	-
By actual meeting	3	-
No	32	62.7
Don't feel it necessary	23	-
Tried; couldn't reach him	2	-
Intend to, but haven't yet	1	-
Other:	6	-
Didn't know about it.		
Never thought of it.		
Everything is in book.		

8. Importance of facilitator		
Should be available with every course	30	58.8
Depends on type of subject taught	16	31.4
Not necessary	4	7.8
Other:	1	2.0
Depends on difficulty of mid-term.		

(Responses to questions 9 through 16 are omitted in this table: their purpose was to supply information on a subjective, individual opinion basis. Responses to these questions are dealt with at appropriate places in discussion of courses.)

17. Number of working TV sets in respondent's household.		
One	25	49.0
Two	17	33.3
Three	3	5.9
Four	1	2.0
No response	5	9.8

		No.	%
18.	Presence of household viewing habits which would interfere with TV student's lesson viewing.		
	Very often	1	2.0
	Not very often	11	21.5
	Seldom	6	11.8
	Never	28	54.9
	No response	5	9.8
19.	Student self-classification		
	Working toward certificate or degree	36	70.6
	General interest student	12	23.5
	Non-student	2	3.9
	Other	1	2.0
20.	Principal occupation of student*		
	Student	13	21.2
	Self-employed	4	6.6
	Employed for wages or salary	21	34.4
	Housewife	20	32.9
	Other: Retired	3	-
21.	Student's position in household.		
	Single, live alone	3	5.9
	Single, live with non-relatives	-	-
	Single, head of household	4	7.8
	Husband or wife	37	72.6
	Son or daughter	7	13.7
22.	Estimated amount of daily TV viewing:	2 hrs. average (per day)	
23.	Reception of Channel 30, compared to that of other stations.		
	Not as good	30	58.8
	As good	20	39.2
	Better	1	2.0

TABLE 56

RESPONSES FOR TV STUDENT INTERVIEWS

* Multiple answers were accepted if student so defined himself.

Psychology

Thirteen of the twenty-seven psychology students who maintained a Course Diary completed an interview with us. While one is certainly liable to receive as many answers to a questions as there are people responding to it, there are nevertheless areas of general concensus. One instance of this for psychology students was the feeling that the material was covered very quickly, that the presentation was too fast in many cases. This observation, coupled with the feeling by some that the content was difficult, e.g., inadequate explanation of unfamiliar vocabulary and abrupt switches among topics, produced a certain amount of discouragement.

Opinions varied widely on the psychology text and syllabus, both on their own merits and on their interrelatedness. Some felt the syllabus was good once one knew how to use it; others didn't like it, feeling its relationship to both text and course was poor. The comments ranged from, "You should emphasize reading syllabus first: I was surprised at how interesting it was." to ". . .hard to get into." One student felt the text wasn't necessary at all: ". . .just take the self-test."

Students gave varying reasons for liking or disliking the psychology course. One said, "Psychology used outside experts and dramatized episodes to illustrate points--it holds your attention better than lectures." Another felt that the course didn't "move," that it left a ". . .lot of space between presentations. The interviews could be better (and the course) needs to be tied together more."

History of Art

Twenty-two (59%) of the thirty-seven art students who maintained the Course Diary completed an interview. Frustration and dissatisfaction were more prevalent with this class than with the others. Students felt the content was presented in a dry and unimaginative fashion. As one commented, "Take advantage of the medium--don't use it like a classroom." Although the pace of the course was seen by one person as too slow--"boring and predictable"--most felt that too much material was covered too quickly.

Probably the syllabus received the most favorable commentary; it was seen by most students to be well written and followed consistently by the course instructor. The textbook, on the other hand, was seen as too general, too expensive and not followed.

The presence of "guest experts" was generally seen as a welcome addition. They provided a change of pace and a difference in viewpoint. The majority of the art students also like the idea of seminars and review sessions, although some were critical of those they attended. Most agreed on the need for additional measurement: more quizzes, more questions, more reviews.

The Great Consumer Contest

The sixteen Course Diary keepers who completed an interview furnish a fairly concise index to the comparatively low evaluation means assigned various aspects of this course (see Table 43). Probably the most widespread criticism concerned what could be summarized as the "low level" of the course

content. Many students felt the information more suited to high school or junior high students; that it was "boring", "obvious", and "hokey". Some students resented the format in which the material was presented, summing it up as contrived and "phony". One commented that there was no attempt to "wrap up concepts". Another can be seen as a spokesman, in effect, saying:

> (Consumer economics) seems to be a shotgun approach--lots of banter and they don't seem to be working together. The pace is too rapid--they want to cover too many points too quickly rather than making a major point and reinforcing it. . . doesn't seem well organized.

Student feeling regarding the text and syllabus was mixed. One student felt the syllabus was good, but the text ". . .not very." Another felt the text was not written with the class in mind; he saw the text, syllabus, and TV presentation as three separate and non-connected items. Some of the criticism here, it should be noted, stems from the students' conflicting notions of the purpose of a syllabus: "The syllabus is poor; it gives you an idea of what the class will answer. Would rather see a syllabus more like a program text, with some learning value of its own." Again, "Syllabus isn't worth a darn, because there's nothing in it on how to handle exams, etc."

One general observation: While the content of any course can be affected by its method and level of presentation, *The Great Consumer Contest* seems to be particularly vulnerable to this kind of influence--enough so that the presentation detracted from, rather than added to, the comprehension of the subject matter.

CONCLUSIONS

The students we contacted enthusiastically endorse televised instruction. Their goals vary: Some are most intent on fulfilling general course requirements, getting a degree, and meeting personal deadlines, while others are

moving at a more leisurely pace toward an eventual goal, or simply want to increase their own general knowledge. But whatever their objective in taking a specific course, they seldom discount the possibility of piling up some college credits.

Because they are concerned with completing a course successfully, that is, getting good grades as well as carrying units, they're aware of all the aspects of the course which they feel contribute to this end. The televised lesson is only part of the course: Text, syllabus, and their coordination with the weekly lessons; the preliminary letter outlining course procedures, the availability and cooperation of the course facilitator, and the frequency and content of study sessions are all important to these students. For example, while only a minority of these students ever have occasion to contact the course facilitator, most of them want to have one available in case they find it necessary.

Taking a TV course is essentially a solitary experience, requiring students to exercise regular study habits and enough self-discipline to do the work without the support of fellow students undergoing the same experience. For this reason, it might be supposed that some contact with their fellow TV students, as well as more frequent visits to the campus, would be desired by these students. This appears to be the case for only a minority: As Table 30 illustrates, TV students overall clearly prefer to view their lessons at home.

Most are satisfied with the present "occasional" visits to campus. They are well aware of the limitations of televised instruction, particularly the

absence of human interaction and feedback from the instructor and other students; but for most of them, given their present work and family requirements and general life style, the advantages far outweigh the disadvantages. For the most part, the suggestions they make for changes or improvements in their TV courses are not with the intent of making it more like an on-campus class experience, but rather to refine the distinctive nature of this quite individualized way of learning.

They ask for more specific guidance on how to study for the course, and that it be given them early in the semester; for information on how they will be graded, and for texts and syllabi which are clearly correlated with the television lessons. They want to get all accompanying texts and written instructions by the time the course begins.

Many felt that two tests per semester, mid-term and final, don't give them the opportunity to discover how well they are learning the material, and that this kind of experience should occur sooner and more often in the semester. Several suggested that mail-in quizzes should be part of the course: With some of this type of interchange, they would have some experience of the instructor's testing style, and an indication of which information he considered most significant.

One of the questions raised at the initiation of television instruction was whether it would provide a way of building on-campus enrollment for local community colleges. While certain of our data (see Tables 5 through 7) suggest that the college TV courses are achieving some success in attracting the

married, working, non-student who is not otherwise affiliated with college, they do not indicate that TV students are becoming on-campus students (see Table 34). Rather, the information thus far suggests that instead of enrolling in on-campus courses as a result of a successful TV course experience, TV students seem inclined to take more TV courses. Regardless, it is to be hoped that as the lives of TV students change--particularly those of housewives with young children--and their educational goals evolve, these positive experiences with television instruction will encourage them to continue their education in whatever form best suited to their needs.

APPENDIX 1

COURSE DIARY INVITATION LETTER

ORANGE COAST COLLEGE

2701 FAIRVIEW ROAD
COSTA MESA, CALIFORNIA 92626

Dear Student:

As part of our evaluation of televised instruction, we are inviting a number of students to maintain weekly diaries of their activities in taking their television courses. Those participating in the study will answer a few questions each week about the television lessons they watched and will be interviewed once during the semester for the purpose of assessing the quality of the television course they are taking. It will require about five minutes per week to keep up the diaries and the interview will be about fifteen minutes long. It will be conducted either on the college campus or at the Coast Community College District administration building.

Students participating in the study will be paid $10 at the end of the semester. We would like to invite you to join the group who will be working with us this semester to help us improve our television courses. If you would like to do this, please fill out the enclosed form and return it using the postage-paid envelope. Becuase we can work with only one hundred students, it is important to return the form immediately. Only the first one hundred who reply will be able to join us.

Thank you, and good luck with your college program.

Best regards,

Richard W. Brightman

Richard W. ~~Brightman~~
Director, Institutional Research
Coast Community College District

RWB/cay

Enclosures: 2

GOLDEN WEST COLLEGE
15744 GOLDEN WEST STREET • HUNTINGTON BEACH • CALIFORNIA 92647
(714) 892-7711

Dear Student:

As part of our evaluation of televised instruction, we are inviting a number of students to maintain weekly diaries of their activities in taking their television courses. Those participating in the study will answer a few questions each week about the television lessons they watched and will be interviewed once during the semester for the purpose of assessing the quality of the television course they are taking. It will require about five minutes per week to keep up the diaries and the interview will be about fifteen minutes long. It will be conducted either on the college campus or at the Coast Community College District administration building.

Students participating in the study will be paid $10 at the end of the semester. We would like to invite you to join the group who will be working with us this semester to help us improve our television courses. If you would like to do this, please fill out the enclosed form and return it using the postage-paid envelope. Becuase we can work with only one hundred students, it is important to return the form immediately. Only the first one hundred who reply will be able to join us.

Thank you, and good luck with your college program.

Best regards,

Richard W. Brightman

Richard W. Brightman
Director, Institutional Research
Coast Community College District

RWB/cay

Enclosures: 2

APPENDIX 2

COURSE DIARY FORM

INSTRUCTIONS

COURSE DIARY

Each week of the semester, answer questions about television lesson watched during the week. Answer the questions only for the one television course for which you are providing information even though you may be enrolled in more than one.

If you did not watch a TV lesson during the week, check question 1 accordingly and skip the remaining questions.

If you watched more than one lesson for the course during the week, write the names of the lessons in the spaces provided in question 2. Then refer to the lessons as "A," "B," or "C," according to the line on which they are written.

COURSE DIARY

COURSE _____
WEEK OF _____

Questions

1. What TV lessons did you watch this week?

_____
_____
_____

☐ I did not watch a lesson this week

2. Were any of the lessons you watched this week lessons you had not watched before?

☐ No
☐ Yes: What were they? A._____ D._____
B._____ E._____
C._____

If you answered "No" to question #2, do not answer any of the remaining questions.

3. For the following, please evaluate the item described by writing a 5 for "excellent," 4 for "very good," 3 for "adequate," 2 for "poor" or a 1 for "bad." Write the number in the column "A," "B," "C," "D," or "E" for the new lesson(s) you watched this week as indicated in question #2.

	Lesson A	Lesson B	Lesson C	Lesson D	Lesson E
a) Content of television presentation					
b) Pace of television presentation					
c) Relevance of TV presentation to the course					
d) Text readings for the lesson					
e) Syllabus readings for lesson					
f) Tech. quality of TV presentation					
g) Scope and balance of information presented in TV lesson					
h) Visiting experts and guests in TV presentation					
i) How would you rate this TV lesson					

c) Relevance of TV presentation to the course

d) Text readings for the lesson

e) Syllabus readings for lesson

f) Tech. quality of TV presentation

g) Scope and balance of information presented in TV lesson

h) Visiting experts and guests in TV presentation

i) How would you rate this TV lesson compared with others for same same course?

j) Overall academic quality of lesson

4. Write the day of the week that you first watched the TV lesson(s). 1st day

5. If you watched the lesson(s) twice this week, write in second day. 2nd day

6. What time(s) during the day did you watch the lesson(s)? 1st day

2nd day

7. What channel(s) did you watch the lesson(s) on? 1st day

2nd day

8. Where did you watch the lesson(s) (Write "home," "campus," "friend's home," etc.) 1st day

2nd day

APPENDIX 3

INTERVIEW SET-UP LETTER

72

GOLDEN WEST COLLEGE
15744 GOLDEN WEST STREET • HUNTINGTON BEACH • CALIFORNIA 92647
(714) 892-7711

Dear Student:

We're very glad you've decided to participate in our evaluation of television courses. By now you should have received your course diary. If you haven't, or if you have any questions, would you please call us at 334-5555.

Interviews are being set up now, to be held at Golden West College on Monday and Tuesday afternoons from 1:00 to 5:00 for the next few weeks. Please mark at least two choices--more if you can--and return this form to us in the envelope provided.

You'll be sent a card telling you the exact date and time of your interview.

	Monday	Tuesday
1:00		
1:30		
2:00		
2:30		
3:00		
3:30		
4:00		
4:30		

If you can't make it at all during this time, please call us and we'll arrange another interview time.

Any Comments?_____

_____

Thanks for your help.

Sincerely,

Jean F. Riss

Jean F. Riss
Research Assistant
Coast Community College District

JFP/cay

ORANGE COAST COLLEGE
2701 FAIRVIEW ROAD
COSTA MESA, CALIFORNIA 92626

Dear Student:

We're very glad you've decided to participate in our evaluation of television courses. By now you should be receiving your course diaries. If you're not, or if you have any questions, would you please call us at 556-5555.

Interviews are being set up now, to be held at Orange Coast College on Wednesday and Thrusday afternoons from 1:00 to 5:00 for the next few weeks. Please mark at least two choices--more if you can--and return this form to us in the envelope provided.

You'll be sent a card telling you the exact date and time of your interview.

	Wednesday	Thursday
1:00		
1:30		
2:00		
2:30		
3:00		
3:30		
4:00		
4:30		

If you can't make it at all during this time, please call us at 556-5555 and we'll arrange another interview time.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

Jean F. Riss

Jean F. Riss
Research Assistant
Coast Community College District

JFR/tlh

APPENDIX 4

TV STUDENT INTERVIEW FORM

TV STUDENT INTERVIEW

1. Why did you decide to take a TV course?

1 ☐ interest in course
2 ☐ convenience
3 ☐ need units
4 ☐ interest in this medium of presentation
5 ☐ job advancement or promotion
6 ☐ other, please specify: _____

2. Is this your first TV class?

1 ☐ yes
2 ☐ no: What other have you taken? _____

3. How did you first learn about your present course?

1 ☐ TV announcement
2 ☐ radio announcement
3 ☐ newspaper
4 ☐ brochure picked up on campus
5 ☐ brochure picked up off campus
6 ☐ schedule of classes
7 ☐ other: _____ (friend, another college campus, previous course, mailed brochure)

4. In which class are you enrolled?

1 ☐ History of Art
2 ☐ Great Consumer Contest
3 ☐ As Man Behaves

5. Are you presently enrolled in other, on-campus courses?

1 ☐ yes: How many units? ____
2 ☐ no

6. How would you rate the letter you received from the instructor when you began the course?

1 ☐ very helpful: answered all my questions regarding the course
2 ☐ helpful, but left out important information (List)
_____
3 ☐ was not helpful (comment)
_____

7. Have you contacted the facilitator for your course?

yes:
1 ☐ by telephone
2 ☐ by actual meeting
Was he or she easily available to you? ____

no:
3 ☐ don't feel it necessary
4 ☐ tried, but couldn't reach instructor
5 ☐ intend to, but haven't yet
6 ☐ other: _____

Turn page over

8. How important is the facilitator?

1 ☐ every course should have them available
2 ☐ depends on the type of subject being taught
3 ☐ not necessary
4 ☐ other: _____

9. From your experience so far, how do you feel about televised instruction as a way of learning? _____

_____

10. What subjects or areas of study do you think might best be taught over television? _____

Why? _____

11. What subjects or areas of study might be least well communicated over TV?

_____

12. What do you think can be done to improve TV instruction? _____

_____

13. Please evaluate the following aspects of the course you are taking by checking the appropriate box.

Aspect	Not Used or Not Observed (1)	Excellent (2)	Very Good (3)	Adequate (4)	Poor (5)	Bad (6)	Comments
a. Textbook							
b. Amount and kind of course information provided by campus facilitators							
c. Content of exams							
d. Scheduling of exams							
e. Grading procedures							
f. Television lessons							
g. Pace of T.V. lessons							
h. Schedule of T.V. lesson broadcasts							

Go on to next page

Aspect	Not Used or Not Observed (1)	Excellent (2)	Very Good (3)	Adequate (4)	Good (5)	Bad (6)	Comments
i. Quality of T.V. Broadcast Reception							
j. Scope and balance of information presented in TV lessons							
k. Relevance of course materials for your needs							
l. Visiting experts and guests in television lessons							
m. Overall academic quality							
n. In comparison with other courses in which you have enrolled, how would you rate this course?							

14. Are there any aspects of the course you feel would be better covered in a classroom situation?

1 ☐ yes: what? _____
2 ☐ no

15. What is the significant characteristic of the best TV course you've taken?

_____

16. What is the significant characteristic of the worst TV course you've taken?

_____

17. How many working television sets are there in your household? _____

18. Does it often happen that others in your household want to view a television program at a time that would prevent you from watching a television lesson broadcast when you wanted to?

1 ☐ yes, very often. I cannot use my home television set to watch lesson broadcasts
2 ☐ yes, but not very often
3 ☐ seldom
4 ☐ never

Turn page over

19. How would you classify yourself?

1 ☐ student working toward certificate or degree
2 ☐ general interest student
3 ☐ non-student
4 ☐ other: _____

20. What is your principal occupation?

1 ☐ student
2 ☐ self-employed
3 ☐ employed for wages or salary
4 ☐ housewife
5 ☐ other: _____

21. What is your position in your household?

1 ☐ single, live alone
2 ☐ single, live with non-relatives
3 ☐ single, head of household
4 ☐ husband or wife
5 ☐ son or daughter

22. How many hours a day would you estimate that you watch television? ____

23. How is your reception of Channel 50, compared to that of other stations?

1 ☐ not as good
2 ☐ as good
3 ☐ better

Thank you for your help.

APPENDIX 5

TELEVISION STUDENT DATA FORM

TELEVISION STUDENT DATA FORM

INSTRUCTIONS: Please check your choice of answer in the box to the right of the question.

1. What is your occupation?

1. Professional	☐ 1	1A
2. Office	☐ 2	
3. Military	☐ 3	
4. Sales/customer service	☐ 4	
5. Business Executive	☐ 5	1B
6. Fine Arts	☐ 6	
7. Tradesman/journeyman/technician	☐ 7	
8. Self-Employed	☐ 8	
9. Other	☐ 9	1C
10. Not currently employed	☐ 10	

2. Is transportation available to take you to and from a college campus or community learning center?

1. Yes	☐ 1	2A
2. No	☐ 2	

3. What is the most important reason for you to enroll in a telecourse?

1. General interest	☐ 1	
2. Professional or occupational inprovement or advancement	☐ 2	3A
3. To earn credit toward a college degree	☐ 3	
4. High school credit	☐ 4	
5. Other: _____	☐ 5	3B

4. How many legal dependents have you that live in your household?

1. One	☐ 1	
2. Two	☐ 2	
3. Three	☐ 3	4A
4. Four	☐ 4	
5. Five or more	☐ 5	
6. None	☐ 6	4B

1. General interest - - -

9. What is your position in your household?

1. Single, live alone - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
2. Single, live with nonrelative(s) - - - - - - - - - -
3. Single, head of household - - - - - - - - - - - - -
4. Husband or Wife - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
5. Son or Daughter - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 → 9A
☐ 5 → 9B

10. Are you a full or part-time student at this time?

1. No -
2. Yes, extension or correspondence course - - - - - -
3. Yes, high school - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
4. Yes, 2-year community college - - - - - - - - - - -
5. Yes, California State College or University - - -
6. Yes, University of California - - - - - - - - - - -

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 → 10A
☐ 5 ☐ 6 → 10B

11. How many hours per week do you work?

1. None -
2. 1 - 9 -
3. 10 - 19 -
4. 20 - 29 -
5. 30 - 39 -
6. 40 - 49 -
7. 50 or more -

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 → 11A
☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 → 11B

12. What is your ethnic or racial background?

1. Caucasion or White - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
2. Mexican or Chicano - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
3. Negro or Black - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
4. Oriental -
5. American Indian - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
6. Other -
7. Decline to state - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 → 12A
☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 → 12B

13. Which would you most prefer as part of your telecourse experience?

1. Visit a college campus regularly - - - - - - - - - -
2. Visit a college campus occasionally - - - - - - - -
3. Never visit a college campus - - - - - - - - - - - -

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 → 13A

14. Please check your age.

1. Caucasion or White - - -

APPENDIX 6

STUDENT EVALUATION OF TELEVISION COURSE

(Distributed to all students present
at final examination)

Course Name

STUDENT EVALUATION
Television Course

As a student, we are most interested in your evaluation of your television course. May we ask you to take a few moments to answer the following questions? Many thanks.

1. How did you learn about the television course?

On-Campus	Off-Campus
1 ☐ Picked up brochure	7 ☐ TV announcement
2 ☐ Class schedule	8 ☐ Radio announcement
3 ☐ Counselor	9 ☐ Newspaper article
4 ☐ Announcement read by instructor	10 ☐ Mail brochure
5 ☐ Bulletin board poster	11 ☐ Friend
6 ☐ Other	12 ☐ Other

2. How much education have you completed?

1 ☐ Below 12th grade
2 ☐ In 12th grade
3 ☐ High school graduate
4 ☐ 0-30 college units completed
5 ☐ 31-60 college units completed
6 ☐ Over 60 units without bachelor's
7 ☐ Bachelor's completed
8 ☐ Master's completed
9 ☐ Doctorate complete

3. If you have taken any regular on-campus college courses, how would you rate this television course in comparison to them?

1 ☐ TV course is harder
2 ☐ TV course is easier
3 ☐ Both about the same difficulty
4 ☐ I have not taken any other college courses

4. What day of the week is best for you to watch television courses?

1 ☐ Monday
2 ☐ Tuesday
3 ☐ Wednesday
4 ☐ Thursday
5 ☐ Friday
6 ☐ Saturday
7 ☐ Sunday

5. What time of day is best?

1 ☐ 6 a.m. - 8 a.m.
2 ☐ 8 a.m. - 11 a.m.
3 ☐ 11 a.m. - 1 p.m.
4 ☐ 1 p.m. - 4 p.m.
5 ☐ 4 p.m. - 7 p.m.
6 ☐ 7 p.m. - 11 p.m.
7 ☐ 11 p.m. - 1 a.m.
8 ☐ 1 a.m. - 8 a.m.

PLEASE TURN PAGE OVER

6. To what extent have you contacted the on-campus course facilitator?

1 ☐ Often
2 ☐ Occasionally
3 ☐ Seldom
4 ☐ Never

7. Has it been easy to contact the on-campus course facilitator?

1 ☐ Never tried
2 ☐ Very easy
3 ☐ Fairly easy
4 ☐ Difficult
5 ☐ Impossible

8. Did you attend the seminars or study sessions?

1 ☐ Yes
2 ☐ No

If No, why not:

3 ☐ Inconvenient times
4 ☐ Did not know about them
5 ☐ Not very helpful
6 ☐ Discontinued the course prior to first session
7 ☐ Other_____

9. Which was the most useful television lesson?_____

Which was the least useful television lesson?_____

10. Would you enroll in a TV course again?

1 ☐ Yes
2 ☐ No

If Yes, what subject area is most important to you?_____

11. Please evaluate the following aspects of your course by checking the appropriate box.

Aspect	Not Used or Not Observed (1)	Excellent (2)	Very Good (3)	Adequate (4)	Poor (5)	Bad (6)	Comment
1. Textbooks							
2. Syllabus							

PLEASE GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE

Aspect	Not Used or Not Observed (1)	Excellent (2)	Very Good (3)	Adequate (4)	Poor (5)	Bad (6)	Comment
3. Amount and kind of course information provided by campus facilitators							
4. Content of exams							
5. Scheduling of exams							
6. Grading procedure							
7. Television lessons							
8. Pace of TV lessons							
9. Schedule of TV lesson broadcasts							
10. Quality of TV broadcast reception							
11. Scope and balance of information presented in TV lessons							
12. Relevance of course materials for your needs							
13. Visiting experts and guests in TV lessons							
14. Overall academic quality							
15. In comparison with other courses in which you have enrolled, how would you rate this course?							

12. What TV channel did you most often watch while taking this course?

1 ☐ KCET-TV, Channel 28
2 ☐ KABC-TV, Channel 7
3 ☐ KOCE-TV, Channel 50

13. Did the course assist you directly at this time?

1 ☐ Yes
2 ☐ No

14. Would you receommend it to someone else?

1 ☐ Yes
2 ☐ No

15. Why did you select this course?

_____

_____

16. What one thing could have been done to improve the course for you?

_____

_____

_____

Many thanks for your help.

APPENDIX 7

REQUEST FORM FOR
STUDENT EVALUATION OF TELEVISION COURSES

90

Coast Community College district

1370 ADAMS AVENUE • COSTA MESA • CALIFORNIA 92626

NORMAN E. WATSON - CHANCELLOR

Dear Student:

Our records show that you did not take the final examination for the television course "Psychology 100." Those who did take the final completed the enclosed Student Evaluation form which will help us evaluate and improve the course.

May we ask you to complete the form and return it using the enclosed, postage-paid envelope.

Many thanks for your help.

Sincerely,

Richard W. Brightman
Director, Institutional Research
Coast Community College District

RWB/cay

APPENDIX 8

STUDENT EVALUATION

(Mailed to all students
who did not take final examination)

STUDENT EVALUATION

As a student, we are most interested in your evaluation of your television course. May we ask you to take a few moments to answer the following questions? Many thanks.

1. How did you learn about the television course?

On-Campus	Off-Campus
1 ☐ Picked up brochure	7 ☐ TV announcement
2 ☐ Class schedule	8 ☐ Radio announcement
3 ☐ Counselor	9 ☐ Newspaper article
4 ☐ Announcement read by instructor	10 ☐ Mail brochure
5 ☐ Bulletin board poster	11 ☐ Friend
6 ☐ Other	12 ☐ Other

2. How much education have you completed?

1 ☐ Below 12th grade	6 ☐ Over 60 units without bachelor's
2 ☐ In 12th grade	7 ☐ Bachelor's completed
3 ☐ High school graduate	8 ☐ Master's completed
4 ☐ 0-30 college units completed	9 ☐ Doctorate completed
5 ☐ 31-60 college units completed	

3. If you have taken any regular on-campus college courses, how would you rate this television course in comparison to them?

1 ☐ TV course is harder
2 ☐ TV course is easier
3 ☐ Both about the same difficulty
4 ☐ I have not taken any other college courses

4. What day of the week is best for you to watch television courses?

1 ☐ Monday	5 ☐ Friday
2 ☐ Tuesday	6 ☐ Saturday
3 ☐ Wednesday	7 ☐ Sunday
4 ☐ Thursday	

5. What time of day is best?

1 ☐ 6 a.m. - 8 a.m.	5 ☐ 4 p.m. - 7 p.m.
2 ☐ 8 a.m. - 11 a.m.	6 ☐ 7 p.m. - 11 p.m.
3 ☐ 11 a.m. - 1 p.m.	7 ☐ 11 p.m. - 1 a.m.
5 ☐ 1 p.m. - 4 p.m.	8 ☐ 1 a.m. - 8 a.m.

Please turn page over

6. To what extent have you contacted the on-campus course facilitator?

1 ☐ Often
2 ☐ Occasionally
3 ☐ Seldom
4 ☐ Never

7. Has it been easy to contact the on-campus course facilitator?

1 ☐ Never tried
2 ☐ Very easy
3 ☐ Fairly easy
4 ☐ Difficult
5 ☐ Impossible

8. Did you attend the seminars or study sessions?

1 ☐ Yes
2 ☐ No

If No, why not:

3 ☐ Inconvenient times
4 ☐ Did not know about them
5 ☐ Not very helpful
6 ☐ Discontinued the course prior to first session
7 ☐ Other _____

9. Which was the most useful television lesson? _____

Which was the least useful television lesson? _____

10. Would you enroll in a TV course again?

1 ☐ Yes
2 ☐ No

If Yes, what subject area is most important to you? _____

11. Please evaluate the following aspects of your course by checking the appropriate box.

	Not Used or Not Observed (1)	Excellent (2)	Very Good (3)	Adequate (4)	Poor (5)	Bad (6)	
1. Textbooks							
2. Syllabus							

Please go on to next page

Aspect	Not Used or Not Observed (1)	Excellent (2)	Very Good (3)	Adequate (4)	Poor (5)	Bad (6)	Comment
3. Amount and kind of course information provided by campus facilitators							
4. Content of exams							
5. Scheduling of exams							
6. Grading procedure							
7. Television lessons							
8. Pace of TV lessons							
9. Schedule of TV lesson broadcasts							
10. Quality of TV broadcast reception							
11. Scope and balance of information presented in TV lessons							
12. Relevance of course materials for your needs							
13. Visiting experts and guests in television lessons							
14. Overall academic quality							
15. In comparison with other courses in which you have enrolled, how would you rate this course?							

Please turn page over

12. What TV channel did you most often watch while taking this course?

1 ☐ KCET-TV, Channel 28
2 ☐ KABC-TV, Channel 7
3 ☐ KOCE-TV, Channel 50

13. Did the course assist you directly at this time?

1 ☐ Yes
2 ☐ No

14. Would you recommend it to someone else?

1 ☐ Yes
2 ☐ No

15. Why did you select this course?

_____

_____

16. Our records show that you did not take the final exam for the course and, as a result have not completed the course.

A. Would you be interested in making up the work necessary to complete the course sometime in the future?

1 ☐ Yes
2 ☐ No

If Yes, write name and address below:

_____
Name

_____
No. Street City Zip Code

B. Why did you not complete the course?

_____

17. What one thing could have been done to improve the course for you?

_____

_____

_____

Thank you for your help

APPENDIX 9

LESSON NUMBER AND TITLE

PSYCHOLOGY:
As Man Behaves

PSYCHOLOGY:
As Man Behaves

LESSON NUMBER	LESSON TITLE
1-8	No Response
9	On Becoming Your Own Teacher
10	Creativity
11	Perception
12	Extra Sensory Perception
13	The Mind of Man - Part I
14	The Mind of Man - Part II
15	The Mind of Man - Part III
16	The Mind of Man - Part IV
17	Nervous System: Biofeedback
18	Emotions
19	Unconscious Motivation
20	The Hocus Pocus of Stage Hypnosis
21	Defense Mechanisms
22	Neuroses
23	Freud: A Psychoanalytic View of Man
24	Psychotherapy: Three Approaches
25	A Conversation with Dr. William Glasser
26	The Psychology of Sexual Inadequacy
27	Group Therapy with Dr. Irene Kassorla
28	Interpersonal Communication
29	Humanistic Psychology
30	A Conversation with Dr. Murray Banks
31	Medical Treatment of Psychosis
32	Psychological Tests - Intelligence
33	Relating
34	Social Psychology: Bill Cosby on Prejudice
35	Human Behavior: A Glimpse of the Future

APPENDIX 10

LESSON NUMBER AND TITLE:

History of Art

History of Art

LESSON NUMBER	LESSON TITLE
1-5	No Response
6	Primitive Arts: The New World
7	Pre-Columbian: South America
8	Pre-Columbian: Mexico
9	Egypt: Old Kingdom
10	Egypt: New Kingdom I
11	Egypt: New Kingdom II
12	The Middle East: Summer and Assyria
13	The Middle East: Babylon and Persia
14	China
15	Korea
16	The Art of Japan
17	The Hindu Art of India
18	The Buddhist Art of India
19	Extensions of Indian Art
20	The Khmer Empire
21	Crete and Peloponnesos
22	The Archaic Greeks and the Etruscans
23	Greek Architecture
24	Hellenism: Greece and Rome
25	Roman Architecture
26	Early Christian Art
27	The Arts of Byzantium - I
28	The Arts of Byzantium - II
29	Early Islamic Art
30	Europe Before Charlemagne: The Early Middle Ages
31	The Carolingian Empire
32	From Ottonian to Romanesque Art
33	Romanesque Architecture: The Pilgrimage Church
34	Notre Dame and Chartres
35	Gothic Art and Literature
36	Extensions of the Gothic
37	Later Gothic Art: Sculpture and Painting
38	Art and Music
39	Folk Arts
40	East-West Comparisons
41	Review Session
42	Museums

APPENDIX 11

LESSON NUMBER AND TITLE

ECONOMICS:
The Great Consumer Contest

ECONOMICS:
The Great Consumer Contest

LESSON NUMBER	LESSON TITLE
1-15	No Response
16	The Great Big Debt Industry
17	Coping with Change
18	Coping with Financial Crisis
19	Coping with the Risk
20	Consumer Protection: Friend or Foe?
21	Raising a Roof
22	Land Loans and Leases
23	Buyer's Guide to the Real Cost of Home Ownership
24	Do it Yourself
25	The Plumber's Friend
26	Monster Machines: Those Major Appliances in Your Life
27	Furniture and Fabrics
28	Pots 'N Pans and Party Payoffs
29	Buying the Service of Others
30	Of Cars and Coughs
31	The Automobile Equation
32	An Affair with Your Engine
33	Whose Fault? Your Fault? No Fault!
34	Here's to Good Health!
35	The Weighting Game
36	Pills 'N Bills
37	The Junk in your Medicine Cabinet
38	Rags without Riches
39	Clothing Care and Repair
40	Services Taxes Buy
41	Taxes and Tal. Tales
42	What Makes a Law a Law?
43	Making Use of Consumer Laws
44	ABC's of Agencies Which Best Protect the Consumer
45	Secrets Your Mother Never Knew

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

SEP 20 1974

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION